

3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.3.1 Introduction

This section presents the existing environment and impacts analysis of biological resource issues associated with the granting of a new lease to Shore Terminals to continue to operate its marine terminal in southwestern Suisun Bay. Section 3.3.2 describes the existing conditions and includes discussion of the regulatory framework on a federal, state, and local level. Section 3.3.2 provides information on biological resources in the San Francisco Bay Estuary and, in more detail, for the project area (Suisun Bay and Carquinez Strait) as well as the immediate vicinity of Shore Terminals' facility.

Section 3.3.3 is the impacts analysis. Biological resources have the potential to be impacted by routine operations related to the Shore terminal or by an accidental release of crude oil or product. Impacts of routine operations are analyzed first followed by a discussion of potential oil spill impacts. A spill of crude oil or product could have wide ranging effects on biological resources in San Francisco Bay. Finally, mitigation measures will be discussed for all significant impacts identified in the impacts analysis.

3.3.2 Existing Conditions

3.3.2.1 Regulatory Setting

Several federal, state, and local agencies have jurisdiction over the biological resources of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. Federal agencies directly responsible for the protection of biological resources are the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is also concerned with the protection of marine and estuarine life through the regulation of water quality standards.

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is responsible for the protection of biological resources at the state level, as well as species officially listed as threatened or endangered by the state, candidates for listing as threatened or endangered, and California Species of Special Concern. The CDFG also regulates fishing and hunting and protects habitat quality. In addition, the CDFG administers the California Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act. The California Coastal Commission (CCC) is responsible for coastal zone management along the coast, except for San Francisco Bay. The California State Water Resources Board sets water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life. These standards are overseen on a local level by the SF-RWQCB.

The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is responsible for coastal zone management within the San Francisco Bay/Delta estuary. The BCDC regulates dredging, filling, and land use in San Francisco Bay below the line of highest tidal action as well as 100 feet inland of the line of highest tidal action.

1 Legislation applicable to the protection of biological resources in San Francisco Bay-
2 Delta estuary and the California outer coast is discussed in the following sections.

3 4 Federal Acts

5 6 Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972 7

8 The CWA was established to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological
9 integrity of the nation's waters. Specific sections of the CWA control the discharge of
10 pollutants and wastes into freshwater and marine environments. Sections 401 of the
11 CWA addresses dredging activities, and requires that dredging and disposal activities
12 must not cause concentrations of chemicals in the water column to exceed state
13 standards. Section 404(b)(1) guidelines require that dredging and disposal activities
14 should have no unacceptable adverse impacts on the ecosystem of concern.

15
16 The National Estuary Program was established in 1987 by amendments to the CWA to
17 identify, restore, and protect nationally significant estuaries of the United States. The
18 San Francisco Estuary Project is one of over 20 Estuary Projects established by the
19 National Estuary Program. The San Francisco Estuary Project is a cooperative federal,
20 state and local program to promote effective management of the San Francisco Bay-
21 Delta Estuary.

22 23 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 24

25 Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA)
26 regulates the transportation and disposal of material in the ocean, and includes
27 regulations and restrictions on the type of material that may be disposed. The
28 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and EPA may prohibit or restrict disposal of
29 material that does not meet the criteria outlined in 40 CFR Part 227.

30 31 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 32

33 The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act requires that whenever a body of water is
34 proposed to be controlled or modified, the lead agency must consult the state and
35 federal agencies responsible for fish and wildlife management (USFWS, CDFG, and
36 NOAA). This act allows for recommendations addressing adverse impacts associated
37 with a Proposed Project, and for mitigating or compensating for impacts on fish and
38 wildlife.

39 40 Marine Mammal Protection Act 41

42 The Marine Mammal Protection Act prohibits the taking (including harassment,
43 disturbance, capture, and death) of any marine mammals except as set forth in the act.
44
45

1 Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972

2
3 The Coastal Zone Management Act requires federal agencies conducting activities
4 directly affecting the coastal zone to proceed in a manner consistent with approved
5 state coastal zone management programs.

6
7 Endangered Species Act of 1973

8
9 The Endangered Species Act protects threatened and endangered species by
10 prohibiting federal actions that would jeopardize the continued existence of such
11 species or adversely affect the critical habitat of these species. The act requires the
12 agencies to consult the USFWS and NOAA, which will evaluate the potential impacts of
13 all aspects of the project on any threatened or endangered species, and provide
14 alternatives or measures to minimize effects caused by a Proposed Project.

15
16 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

17
18 The Migratory Bird Treaty Act protects certain migratory birds including all seabirds by
19 limiting hunting, capturing, selling, purchasing, transporting, importing, exporting, killing,
20 or possession of the birds, or their nests or eggs.

21
22 Oil Pollution Act of 1990

23
24 The Oil Pollution Act of 1990, along with the Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation
25 Act of 1989, provides for cleanup authority, penalties, and liability for oil pollution. The
26 Oil Pollution Act creates the Oil Spill Compensation Fund to pay for removal of and
27 damages from oil pollution.

28
29 National Invasive Species Act of 1996

30
31 This act calls for the implementation of measures to halt the spread of invasive species.
32 To comply with this act, the USCG proposes voluntary guidelines to control the invasion
33 of aquatic nuisance species via ship ballast water (North 1998).

34
35 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.
36 1801 et seq.)

37
38 The 1996 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and
39 Conservation Act set forth a number of new mandates for the NOAA, regional fishery
40 management councils, and other federal agencies to identify and protect important
41 marine and anadromous fish habitat. The Councils, with assistance from NOAA, are
42 required to delineate "essential fish habitat" (EFH) for all managed species. The Act
43 defines EFH as "... those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning,
44 breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity." Federal action agencies which fund, permit,
45 or carry out activities that may adversely impact EFH are required to consult with NOAA
46 regarding the potential effects of their actions on EFH, and respond in writing to the

fishery service's recommendations. For the Pacific region, EFH has been identified for a total of 89 species covered by three fishery management plans (FMPs) under the auspices of the Pacific Fishery Management Council.

State Acts

California Endangered Species Act of 1984

This act provides for the recognition and protection of rare, threatened, and endangered species of plants and animals.

California Coastal Act of 1976 as Amended 1983

The California Coastal Act provides various levels of protection for areas of special concern through designations of marine life refuges, reserves, ecological reserves, and areas of special biological significance.

Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act of 1990

The Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act of 1990 (SB 2040) requires that a state oil spill contingency plan be established with a specific component to include a marine oil spill contingency planning element.

California Wetlands Conservation Policy (California Executive Order W-59-93)

This state policy recognizes the value of marshlands and other wetlands. The policy states that there be no net loss of wetland acreage and a long-term gain in the quantity, quality, and permanence of wetland acreages and values in California.

McAteer-Petris Act

This act established the San Francisco Bay Plan for the protection of the Bay and its natural resources and the development of the Bay and shoreline to their highest potential with a minimum of Bay fill. This Act established the San Francisco BCDC as the agency responsible for maintaining and carrying out the provisions of the Act. The Act directs the BCDC to exercise its authority to issue or deny permit applications for placing or extracting materials, or changing the use of any land, water, or structure within the area of its jurisdiction, in conformity with the provisions and policies of both the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan.

California Ballast Water Management for Control of Nonindigenous Species Act of 1999 (AB 703)

This Act requires vessels to employ prescribed ballast water management practices to reduce the uptake and release of nonindigenous species into state waters. The bill requires the SLC to take samples of ballast water and sediment and to take other action to assess the compliance of any vessel with the prescribed requirements.

3.3.2.2 San Francisco Bay Estuary

Biological Characteristics of the Estuary

Because tankers that service the Shore marine terminal travel throughout San Francisco Bay, all of the tidally influenced biological resources of the estuary may be at some risk from operations at the marine terminal. Therefore, this section provides a brief overview of the biological resources of the estuary. The tidally influenced biological resources of the San Francisco Bay estuary are described in detail in the Unocal EIR (Chambers Group 1994).

The San Francisco Bay estuary, which extends from the mouth of Coyote Creek near the city of San Jose in the south to Chippis Island at the eastern end of Suisun Bay, is the largest coastal embayment on the Pacific Coast of the United States (Figure 3.3-1). It has a surface area of 1,166 square kilometers (km²) (450 square miles). San Francisco Bay is located at the mouth of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system, which carries runoff from 40 percent of the surface area of California (Nichols et al. 1986). The Bay is characterized by broad shallows with an average depth of 6 meters (m) MLLW (Conomos et al. 1985). The deepest sections of the Bay are channels at the Golden Gate (110 m depth) and Carquinez Strait (27 m depth), whose depths are maintained by strong tidal currents. As shown in Figure 3.3-1, the San Francisco estuary consists of five distinct subareas: Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait, San Pablo Bay, Central Bay, and South Bay. Each of these areas has its own characteristic biological assemblage.

Reduction in freshwater inflows from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers has profoundly altered the aquatic environment of the estuary. The freshwater inflow to San Francisco Bay is less than 50 percent of historic levels (Monroe and Kelly 1992). Diversion of water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system away from San Francisco Bay has had profound effects on the marine resources of the Bay, most noticeably on the anadromous fishes such as striped bass and salmon, which live part of their lives in the open ocean but depend on the rivers for spawning. The CALFED Bay-Delta Program was established by state and federal agencies in 1994 to find a long-term solution to water supply and environmental problems in the Bay and Delta (CALFED 1998). The biological resources of San Francisco Estuary also have been affected profoundly by the introduction of non-indigenous species. Introduced species are discussed in detail in the next section.

Phytoplankton production is the major source of organic matter in the estuary (Jassby et al. 1996; Corps, EPA, BCDC, SFBRWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). While the phytoplankton community in Central Bay is similar to the open ocean, the community in the northern reaches of the estuary is unique and has undergone profound changes in the last two decades. Phytoplankton distribution in the northern reach is characterized by an extremely high population in the entrapment zone, which usually occurs near the 2 parts per thousand (ppt) isohaline (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). This zone of high production is important to several fish species (Kimmerer et al. 1998). In addition to a high concentration of phytoplankton, maximum abundances of several species of

1 **Figure 3.3-1 The Major Regions of San Francisco Bay**

1 zooplankton occur in the entrapment zone (Kimmerer et al. 1998). The entrapment
2 zone is usually positioned in Suisun Bay in spring and summer. The complex
3 interactions between movement of the salt field, gravitational circulation, and retention
4 of particles and organisms in the entrapment zone are currently being studied
5 (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). There have been recent reductions in the
6 abundance of phytoplankton in Suisun Bay, apparently because of intensive filter
7 feeding by the Asian clam, *Potamocorbula amurensis* (Herbold et al. 1991), an invasive
8 introduced species, first reported in the estuary in 1986. Phytoplankton populations in
9 the northern reaches of the Estuary may now be continuously and permanently
10 controlled by introduced clams (Cohen and Carlton 1995). Since the appearance of
11 *Potamocorbula* the summer diatom bloom has disappeared, presumably because of
12 increased filter feeding (Kimmerer 1998). The *Potamocorbula* population in the
13 northern reaches of the estuary can filter the entire water column over the channels
14 more than once per day and over the shallows almost 13 times per day (Cohen and
15 Carlton 1995).

16
17 The most abundant zooplankton species in San Francisco Bay is the copepod, *Acartia*
18 *clausi*. Standing stocks as high as 150,000 individuals per square meter have been
19 recorded in the southern reach (Davis 1982). In the northern reach, this coastal species
20 is found with zooplankton species characteristic of brackish waters (Painter 1966,
21 Kimmerer and Orsi 1996, Corps and Contra Costa County 1997). Overall, three
22 species (*Acartia clausi*, *Eurytemora affinis*, and *Neomysis mercedis*) have been found to
23 be the most abundant species both in the channels and in the shallow flats of San Pablo
24 and Suisun Bays. Dominant zooplankters distribute themselves in the estuary
25 according to salinity. *Acartia clausi* is found in more saline water. *Eurytemora affinis* is
26 always most abundant near fresh water in salinities less than 10 ppt.

27
28 Most species of copepods have shown pronounced long-term declines in abundance in
29 the San Francisco Bay estuary system (Herbold et al. 1991, CalFed 1998). Invasion of
30 the western Delta and Suisun Bay by the introduced copepods, *Sinocalanus doerri*, in
31 1978 and *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi* in 1987, was followed by declines in *Eurytemora*
32 *affinis* and the almost complete elimination of another copepod, *Diaptomus* spp. Most
33 copepods, including *Acartia*, have been at low abundance in Suisun Bay since the
34 arrival and spread of the Asian clam. Research suggests that the decrease in *E. affinis*
35 in Suisun Bay was by direct loss to clam filtration (Lehman 1998).

36
37 The opossum shrimp, *Neomysis mercedis*, is an especially important zooplankton
38 species in the northern reach because it is the dominant species in the diet of young-of-
39 the-year fishes (Orsi and Knutson 1979). This species is most abundant at salinities up
40 to 10 ppt and is almost never found at salinities greater than 20 ppt (Davis 1982).
41 *Neomysis* is found in most abundance in Suisun Bay and the western Delta (Herbold
42 et al. 1991). *Neomysis* abundance is related to outflows from the Delta. When outflows
43 are high, phytoplankton populations spread out into the broad shallows of Suisun Bay;
44 light levels are high and a bloom occurs providing more food for opossum shrimp
45 (Herbold and Moyle 1989). During years of low flows, the entrapment zone moves
46 upstream into the deep channels of the Sacramento River, and productivity declines
47 with a subsequent decline in *Neomysis* populations. The *Neomysis* population has

declined to less than one-tenth of its former abundance, particularly since 1986 (CALFED 1998). The continuing decline in the 1990's despite the return of higher river outflows is of particular concern. The observed declines in zooplankton abundance have roughly coincided with the decline in phytoplankton, one of the main food sources for zooplankton (CALFED 1998). The deterioration of the zooplankton community and its phytoplankton food supply in key habitat areas of the Bay-Delta is a serious problem because striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*), Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*), Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and other species that use Suisun Bay and the Delta as a nursery area feed almost exclusively on zooplankton during early life.

Except for limited areas of natural rocky shores near the Golden Gate and in Central Bay, and manmade hard substrate in the form of riprap, docks, and pilings, most of the substrate throughout the San Francisco Bay estuary consists of soft bottom. Almost all the common benthic invertebrates in San Francisco Bay are introduced species. As with the plankton community, each of the Bays of San Francisco estuary has its own characteristic soft bottom benthic community (Davis 1982). The distribution of soft bottom benthic species in San Francisco Bay is most closely correlated to temporal variations in salinity and to sediment type (Lowe 1999). The greatest number of species is found in Central Bay which most closely resembles that of the open ocean. Away from the marine environment of Central Bay, the benthos is characterized by low diversity and dominated by a few species that are common to many North American estuaries and are tolerant of wide variations in salinity. Because most of the estuary is dominated by these few opportunistic species, the species compositions of the intertidal mudflats, the shallow subtidal, and the ship channels are similar. In general, the shallow subtidal supports a greater number of species than either the intertidal mudflats or the ship channels.

Special interest benthic species in San Francisco Bay include Dungeness crabs, grass shrimp, and a plant, eelgrass. Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*) is a valuable commercial fishery for San Francisco and has been for over a century (Corps, EPA, BCDC, SFBRWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). San Francisco Bay is an important nursery area for Dungeness crabs (Tasto 1979; Herbold et al. 1991). Studies have demonstrated that Dungeness crab reared in San Francisco Estuary grow at about twice the rate of ocean-reared crabs (Baxter et al. 1999). Dungeness crabs enter San Francisco Bay as juveniles during March through June (Baxter et al. 1999). By September young crabs are widely distributed in San Pablo and lower Suisun Bays. The crabs leave the Bay by August or September of the following year. Dungeness crabs are particularly abundant from Richardson's Bay upstream through Suisun Bay, showing greater abundance upstream during years of low outflow. San Pablo Bay is the area of most consistently high numbers of juvenile Dungeness crabs.

The smaller epibenthic fauna of San Francisco Bay is dominated by four species of shrimp known as grass shrimp (Herbold et al. 1991, Reilly et al. 2001). These shrimp are important prey for estuary fishes and also support a commercial bait fishery (Corps, EPA, BCDC, SFBRWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). Grass shrimp include three native species (*Crangon franciscorum*, *C. nigricauda*, and *C. nigromaculata*) and one introduced species (*Palaemon macrodactylus*). *Crangon franciscorum* (California bay

1 shrimp) are most abundant in lower salinities with young occurring in water that is
2 almost fresh; *C. nigricauda* (blacktail bay shrimp) prefer salinities of 25 ppt or more; and
3 *C. nigromaculata* (blackspotted bay shrimp) are seldom found at salinities below 30 ppt
4 (Herbold et al. 1991). *Palaemon macrodactylus* is most common in lower salinity areas
5 (Reilly et al. 2001). The center of its distribution is Suisun Bay and the West Delta.

6
7 Eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) is an important shallow subtidal and intertidal flowering plant
8 of bays and estuaries. Eelgrass beds are recognized as a particularly valuable type of
9 marine habitat that enhances the physical and biological environment where they occur
10 (Phillips 1988). Eelgrass beds are highly productive (Ware 1993). In addition, these
11 beds stabilize the substrate and add structure to the monotonous soft bottom. Several
12 studies have demonstrated that the marine life in eelgrass meadows is enhanced in
13 numbers, species, and standing crop compared to unvegetated soft bottom habitat
14 (summarized in Ware 1993). Eelgrass beds in San Francisco Estuary are found from
15 lower San Pablo Bay to South Bay at Coyote Point. The depth range of eelgrass in
16 San Francisco Bay is from Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) to 1.5 meters (5 feet) below
17 MLLW (Caltrans 2001). Eelgrass habitats are dynamic, expanding and contracting by
18 as much as several hectares per season, depending on the variations in key
19 environmental factors.

20
21 Over 100 species of fish have been recorded from the San Francisco Bay estuarine
22 system (Armor and Herrgesell 1985). These species vary in the way they use the Bay,
23 from those that spend their entire lives in the Bay to those that spend only part of their
24 life cycle there. The only fish species confined entirely to the Bay-Delta estuary is the
25 Delta smelt, although the ecologically similar longfin smelt (*Spirinchus thaleichthys*)
26 occurs very rarely outside the Golden Gate (Herbold et al. 1991). All other species
27 maintain at least part of their population outside the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary
28 system. In general, the fishes of the San Francisco estuary fall into four categories:
29 true estuarine species, freshwater species, marine species, and anadromous species
30 (Corps, EPA, BCDC, SFBWQCB, SWRCB 1998). San Francisco Bay is basically a
31 marine environment, although salinities can be appreciably diluted by freshwater during
32 high outflow years allowing freshwater fishes to move into the tributary streams
33 (Moyle 2002).

34
35 Marine species include those which are only seasonally present and those that maintain
36 at least part of their population in San Francisco Bay year-round. Seasonal species
37 comprise many of the most abundant species found in the Bay (Herbold et al. 1991).
38 Abundant seasonal species include northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*) and Pacific
39 herring (*Clupea harengus*).

40
41 Anadromous species are those that spend their adult lives in the open ocean and come
42 into fresh water to spawn. Anadromous species use the San Francisco Bay estuary on
43 their way up the rivers to spawn and as a rearing area for juveniles on their way down
44 from their birthplace in the river to the open ocean (Herbold et al. 1991). Native
45 anadromous species include Chinook salmon, steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*
46 *gairdneri*) and both green and white sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris* and
47 *A. transmontanus*). Introduced anadromous species include striped bass (*Morone*

1 *satatilis*), and American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*). Anadromous species are sensitive to
2 a wide variety of environmental changes, including upstream alteration of spawning
3 habitat, interference with access to spawning habitat, changes in flow patterns, and
4 conditions in the estuary that reduce its value as a nursery site for outmigrating young
5 (Herbold et al. 1991).

6
7 Vegetated tidal marshes are an extremely productive and important habitat in the
8 San Francisco estuary. More than 91 percent of the tidal wetlands in San Francisco
9 Bay estuary have been lost to reclamation for farmland, salt evaporation ponds, and
10 residential or industrial development (USGS 2002). Recent efforts have been made to
11 protect and restore tidal marshes in the Bay. Three types of tidal marshes, related to
12 extent of freshwater influence, are found in the San Francisco Bay estuary: saltmarsh,
13 brackish marsh, and freshwater marsh. These marshes are exposed to the rise and fall
14 of tides and are characterized by emergent vascular plants. Tidal cycles affect the
15 vertical extent of marshes as well as their inundation period and tidal flushing.

16
17 Dominant plant species define the three marsh types, and zonation patterns of the
18 dominant species within the marshes are apparent. In general, saltmarsh wetlands are
19 dominated by Pacific cordgrass (*Spartina foliosa*) and pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*),
20 brackish marshes are dominated by various species of bulrush, and freshwater marshes
21 are dominated by bulrush, reed grass (*Phragmites communis*), and cattails (*Typha* spp.).
22 Differences in species composition between tidal marshes and plant zonation within
23 marshes are based on plant physiological responses to physical factors of inundation,
24 salinity, and sedimentation. In addition, interspecific competition can be a significant
25 factor determining plant distributions in tidal marshes. Because most marsh plants
26 reproduce vegetatively, each species can respond relatively quickly to favorable
27 physical conditions and, therefore, seasonality can also affect the patterns of plant
28 distribution in the tidal marshes (Josselyn 1983).

29
30 Tidal marsh occurs throughout the San Francisco estuary. The largest areas of tidal
31 marsh are on the northern edge of San Pablo Bay and along the Petaluma River.
32 Suisun Bay, too, supports a substantial acreage of tidal marsh, while Central Bay
33 supports relatively little.

34
35 In addition to tidal wetlands, the San Francisco estuary includes diked wetlands, areas
36 that have been isolated from natural tidal action. The largest area of diked wetlands is
37 in the northern part of Suisun Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

38
39 San Francisco Estuary is vitally important to many species of water-associated birds.
40 San Francisco Estuary is important as a major refuge for many species of shorebirds
41 and waterfowl during their migration and wintering season (August through April) and it
42 provides breeding habitat during the summer for several species (including the
43 endangered California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*) and threatened western
44 snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*)). Habitat types in contact with tidal
45 waters (and potentially spilled oil) in San Francisco Estuary include open water, rocky
46 shore, intertidal mudflats, and tidal marshes. Each has a characteristic fauna.

1 The avifauna of open water includes loons and grebes, pelicans and cormorants, gulls
2 and terns, and a variety of waterfowl including ducks and scoters. The San Francisco
3 Bay region has been identified as one of 34 waterfowl habitat areas of major concern in
4 the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (USFWS 1989). More than 30 species
5 of waterfowl are found in the San Francisco Bay ecosystem (Goals Project 1998).
6 Mid-winter surveys from 1998 to 2000 found scaup (*Aythya sp.*) comprise 43.2 percent of
7 all waterfowl in the entire San Francisco Estuary, 64 percent of all waterfowl on open
8 water in South Bay, and 67 percent of all waterfowl on open water in Central Bay
9 (URS 2002). The second most abundant waterfowl in San Francisco Bay were scoters,
10 which accounted for 25 percent of the waterfowl in South Bay and 29 percent of the
11 waterfowl in Central Bay.

12
13 Rocky shores provide foraging habitat for turnstones and oystercatchers, and roosts for
14 cormorants, pelicans, gulls, and terns. Intertidal mudflats are predominantly populated
15 by shorebirds, and the mudflats of San Francisco Bay are of critical importance in the
16 winter as feeding/staging areas for migrating shorebirds on the Pacific Flyway. The
17 San Francisco Bay estuary is used by over one million shorebirds during spring
18 migration and is home to several hundred thousand during winter (Hui et al. 2001).
19 A recent study of shorebird abundance and distribution on the Pacific Coast of the
20 United States found that San Francisco Bay accounted for many more shorebirds than
21 any other wetland in all seasons (Page et al. 1999). Most shorebird use occurs in the
22 southern reach of the estuary (South Bay) (Hui et al. 2001). Tidal salt and brackish
23 marshes provide essential habitat to support clapper and black rails (*Rallus longirostris*
24 *obsoletus* and *Laterallus jamaicensis contorniculus*), herons and egrets, the salt-marsh
25 yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas sinuosa*), and saltmarsh song sparrows (*Melospiza*
26 *melodia*).

27
28 Three species of marine mammals can be included in the resident fauna of the
29 San Francisco Bay region: the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), the harbor seal
30 (*Phoca vitulina*), and the California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*). Gray (*Eschrichtius*
31 *robustus*) and humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) may occasionally wander
32 into the Bays but typically live off the open coast. Visits of these species have occurred
33 in recent years as migrating animals strayed into the Bays during coastwise migration in
34 the winter/spring (gray whales) or fall (humpback whales).

35 36 Introduced Species

37
38 Over 230 non-native species have become established in the San Francisco estuary
39 (Cohen 1998). Exotic species dominate many of the estuary's aquatic assemblages,
40 including soft bottom benthic communities, fouling communities, brackish-water
41 zooplankton in the northern reach, and freshwater fishes. In these communities,
42 introduced species may account for 40 to 100 percent of the common species, up to
43 97 percent of the total organisms, and up to 99 percent of the biomass (Cohen 1998).
44 Furthermore, the rate of invasions has been increasing. About half of the exotic species
45 identified in the San Francisco estuary were first recorded within the last 35 years. The
46 rate of invasions has increased from about one new species established every
47 55 weeks between 1851 and 1960 to one new species established every 14 weeks from

1 1961 to 1995 (Cohen 1998). Some of these invasions have greatly altered habitat
2 structure and nutrient and contaminant pathways. In addition, introduced species have
3 contributed to reductions and extinctions of native species through predation,
4 competition, and the introduction of parasites (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

5
6 The Asian clam (*Potamocorbula amurensis*) is an example of a species that was
7 recently introduced to the detriment of the natural ecosystem. This euryhaline clam,
8 first collected in 1986, appears to have been introduced as larvae in the seawater
9 ballast of cargo vessels (Carlton et al. 1990). Within 2 years, it spread throughout the
10 estuary, where it reached densities in some areas of over 10,000 individuals per square
11 meter. Nichols et al. (1990) suggest that the Asian clam may have permanently
12 displaced the native benthic community in parts of Suisun Bay. In addition, overgrazing
13 by these large populations of the Asian clam appears to have decimated the
14 phytoplankton in Suisun Bay (Cohen and Carlton 1995, Thompson 2000, San Francisco
15 Estuary Project 1997). Conservative estimates of grazing rates suggest that this clam
16 population is capable of filtering the water column one to two times per day in the
17 shallow waters of Suisun Bay. Asian clams also consume young stages of copepods
18 and compete with mysid shrimp and other zooplankton species for food. Several small
19 crustaceans, including copepods and mysid shrimp, declined sharply in abundance and
20 range following the spread of the clam (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

21
22 Two recently introduced crab species, the green crab (*Carcinus maenas*) and the
23 Chinese mitten crab (*Eriocheir sinensis*), also pose a threat to the ecosystem. The
24 green crab, a native of the European Atlantic coast, was first collected in San Francisco
25 Bay in 1989 to 1990 (Cohen et al. 1995). It has become abundant in intertidal and
26 shallow subtidal areas and has spread throughout Central Bay, South Bay, and
27 San Pablo Bay to Carquinez Strait. It may have arrived in ballast water, on ship hulls,
28 amongst algae with imported live bait or lobsters, or by intentional release. The green
29 crab is a voracious predator that has been documented to have reduced bivalve
30 populations in New England and Europe (Cohen et al. 1995). Competition with the
31 green crab for food resources could affect shorebirds and possibly the Dungeness crab
32 (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

33
34 The Chinese mitten crab was first collected in south San Francisco Bay in 1992 and has
35 since spread rapidly throughout the estuary (Veldhuizen and Hieb 1998). It was
36 collected in San Pablo Bay in 1994 and Suisun Marsh and the Delta in 1996. In 1996, a
37 total of 45 mitten crabs were collected from the Delta, Suisun Bay, and Suisun Marsh.
38 By 1997, the number of mitten crabs captured in the Delta rose to over 20,000. The
39 most probable mechanism of introduction in California was either deliberate release to
40 establish a fishery or accidental release via ballast water. The high density of mitten
41 crab burrows in steep banks could accelerate bank erosion and slumping and threaten
42 the structural integrity of levees in the Delta (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). The
43 mitten crab may also have profound effects on other species through competition
44 (Veldhuizen and Hieb 1998).

1 The invasive burrowing isopod *Sphaeroma quoyanum* increases erosion in salt
2 marshes by excavating dense burrow complexes along the banks of salt marsh
3 channels (Talley et al. 2001). This species was introduced to San Francisco Bay,
4 probably from the hulls of wooden ships, in the late nineteenth century.

5
6 Invasions of non-native species includes microorganisms. The Japanese foraminifer
7 *Trochammia hadai* was first found in San Francisco Bay in sediment samples taken in
8 1983 and since 1986 has been collected at 91 percent of the sampled sites in the Bay,
9 constituting up to 93 percent of the foraminiferal assemblage at individual sites
10 (McGann et al. 2000). The proliferation of *T.hadai* in San Francisco Bay is associated
11 with a decline in relative abundance of one of the most common native foraminifers
12 *Elphidium excavatum*. *T.hadai* probably was transported from Japan in ships' ballast
13 tanks, in mud associated with anchors, or in sediments associated with oysters
14 imported for mariculture. Its remarkable invasion of San Francisco Bay suggests the
15 potential for massive, rapid invasions by other marine microorganisms (McGann et al.
16 2000).

17
18 Exotic species have been introduced to the San Francisco estuary by deliberate fish
19 introductions, in imported oyster cultures, from ship hulls, and by ballast water
20 discharges. While the former mechanisms were important in the past, in recent years
21 ballast water discharges are thought to be the primary means through which exotic
22 species become established in the Bay (Cohen 1998). Of the exotic species that were
23 first reported in the estuary in 1986 to 1995, between 47 and 77 percent arrived in
24 ballast water.

25
26 Ships take up ballast water when their cargo is unloaded, fuel is consumed, extra
27 stability is needed due to heavy seas, or the ship is too tall to pass under a bridge. The
28 weight of the water taken into a ship's holds lowers the vessel's profile and makes it
29 more stable. When the ship takes up ballast, organisms in the water, mud or nearby
30 pier pilings get pumped into the ships hold along with the water. When the ship reaches
31 its destination, it may discharge the ballast in the port. Organisms stored in the holds
32 are released to the new port where they may thrive.

33
34 Between 2.5 and 5 billion gallons of ballast water are estimated to be discharged to the
35 San Francisco estuary per year (Cohen 1998). The average volume of ballast water
36 discharged by tankers in the estuary has been estimated to be about 2.5 million gallons
37 per tanker.

38
39 Sampling of organisms in ship ballast water suggests that densities between 0.1 and
40 1 relatively large planktonic organisms per gallon and greater densities of smaller
41 organisms may frequently be present in ballast water at the conclusion of a
42 transoceanic voyage (Cohen 1998). Because the number and diversity of organisms
43 decline substantially over the duration of a voyage, ships that travel shorter distances,
44 such as most of the tankers servicing the Shore terminal, would have greater densities.
45 Given the large capacity of ship's ballast water pumps, a single deballasting ship may
46 therefore discharge into the environment millions of exotic phytoplankton and
47 invertebrate zooplankton per hour, and larger numbers of protists, bacteria, and viruses.

1 The National Invasive Species Act was passed in 1996. This act prescribed mandatory
2 regulations for the Great Lakes and Hudson River and added voluntary guidelines for
3 the rest of the country.

4
5 The California Ballast Water Management for Control of Nonindigenous Species Act
6 was passed in 1999. This Act prescribes mandatory legislation for the waters of the
7 state of California designed to reduce the introduction of invasive nonindigenous
8 species to California waters.

9
10 Although ballast water discharges are probably responsible for the greatest number of
11 non-indigenous species introduced to San Francisco Bay, recent data indicate ship
12 fouling has a higher potential for exotic species introduction than previously believed
13 (Brancato 1999). Reports from Germany and Australia found over 400 invasive species
14 that were introduced in waters directly from the fouled hulls of ships. About one third of
15 the exotic marine species in Australia harbors were determined to have been introduced
16 via hull fouling. In the Pacific Northwest and San Francisco Bay, the European green
17 crab is a major nuisance species believed to have come from accumulated fouling on
18 the hulls of ships.

19 20 Rare/Threatened/Endangered Species

21 22 Sensitive Plants

23
24 Listed plant species that occur in tidal wetlands in the San Francisco Bay region are
25 presented in Table 3.3-1. Sensitive species associated with nontidal wetlands, such as
26 vernal pools, are not included in this summary because they would not be impacted by
27 the continued operation of the Shore marine terminal. The following section provides
28 information on specific habitats, life history, and locations of the sensitive plants listed in
29 Table 3.3-1.

30
31 Distributions of known sensitive plant populations in the study area within 250 feet
32 (horizontal distance) of the shoreline were evaluated, based on records in the California
33 Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). This horizontal distance was used as a study
34 limit under the presumption that it encompasses elevations up to a maximum of about
35 +7 feet mean sea level (MSL) and thus includes all listed plant species that could be
36 affected by a project related oil spill. In addition to the CNDDDB records, there are a
37 number of sensitive plant sites reported in Volume II of the Area Contingency Plan
38 (USCG and OSPR 2000). The following text summarizes both the CNDDDB and
39 Contingency Plan data.

Table 3.3-1
Special Status Plant Species of
Tidal Marshes of the San Francisco Bay Region*

Common Name/Scientific Name	Status		Habitat
	State	Federal	
Marsh sandwort <i>Arenaria paludicola</i>	E	E	Fresh, Salt, and brackish marshes
Suisun thistle <i>Cirsium hydrophilum</i> var. <i>hydrophilum</i>	--	E	Brackish Marshes
Soft bird's beak <i>Cordylanthus mollis</i> ssp. <i>mollis</i>	R	E	Salt and brackish marshes
California seablite <i>Suaeda californica</i>	R	E	Salt marshes
Mason's lilaeopsis <i>Lilaeopsis masonii</i>	R	--	Brackish marshes
Federal Status (determined by USFWS) E = Federally listed, endangered State Status T = State listed, threatened E = State listed, endangered R = State listed, rare * Sensitive plant species in San Francisco Estuary that are on California Native Plant Society lists but no federal or State lists include Suisun marsh aster (<i>Aster lentus</i>), Delta tule pea (<i>Lathyrus jepsoni</i> var <i>jepsoni</i>), and Delta mudwort (<i>Limosella subulata</i>) Sources: CDFG 2002.			

Tidal habitats of San Francisco Estuary support five plant species that are on federal and/or state lists as threatened, endangered, or rare: California seablite (*Suaeda californica*), marsh sandwort (*Arenaria paludicola*), Mason's lilaeopsis (*Lilaeopsis masonii*), soft bird's beak (*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *mollis*), and Suisun thistle (*Cirsium hydrophilum* var. *hydrophilum*). All of these species occur in marsh communities at various locations in the estuary, primarily around Suisun Bay and its tributary sloughs. In general, all marsh habitat in the Bay region can be considered actual or potential habitat for federally and/or state-listed threatened, endangered, or rare plant species, or species considered as such by the California Native Plant Society (CNPS).

Suisun Thistle (*Cirsium hydrophilum* var. *hydrophilum*)

This perennial herb is found in brackish marshes and in peaty soils around Suisun Bay in Solano County. It flowers from July through September. It is a federal endangered species and a CNPS 1B species. According to the CNDDb (CDFG 2002), this plant occurs in the Suisun Marsh near Grizzly Island. Dominant species associated with the Suisun thistle were bulrushes, cinquefoil (*Potentilla* sp.), and rushes.

Soft Bird's Beak (*Cordylanthus mollis* ssp. *mollis*)

This branched annual is found in the coastal salt and brackish marshes of the San Francisco Bay region. It flowers from July to November. It is a State Rare species, Federal Endangered species, and a CNPS 1B species. According to the CNDDb,

several populations occur in San Pablo Bay, including the Tule Slough on the Petaluma River, in northern San Pablo Bay near Tubbs Island, in the upper Napa River marsh, and on the southern edge of San Pablo Bay east of Pinole Point. Several populations are found on the north side of the Carquinez Strait at Benicia, and in the Montezuma and Suisun Sloughs north of Grizzly Bay, and in the Shore Acres area in south Suisun Bay (CDFG 2002). Dominant species associated with the soft-haired bird's beak include saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), pickleweed (*Salicornia virginica*), Jaumea (*Jaumea carnosa*) and, occasionally, bulrushes.

Mason's Lilaeopsis (*Lilaeopsis masonii*)

This low, tufted perennial inhabits marshes and brackish flats made up of moist sand and mud in Solano County. It flowers from June through August. It is state-listed as rare, and is a CNPS 1B species. According to the Natural Diversity Data Base, populations range from the Napa River above the salt evaporators, north of San Pablo Bay, to the northern reaches of the Suisun and Montezuma Sloughs north of Grizzly Bay, with a majority of the populations found at the convergence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, including Brown's Island and the lower Sherman Marsh and throughout the Delta, with populations extending up both the San Joaquin and Sacramento Rivers (CDFG 2002). It extends west as far as Mare Island. Populations also occur along the shore of Peyton Slough (Bullhead Marsh), in the immediate project vicinity (URS 2002b).

California Seablite (*Suaeda californica*)

California seablite is state rare and federal endangered. It is a low-growing, evergreen, perennial shrub with fleshy leaves, in the goosefoot family (Chenopodiaceae). Occurrence records indicate a general association with coastal saltmarshes, but the description of its precise habitat seems to vary depending on what taxonomic reference is consulted. Collectively, the available information suggests that the species favors the upper saltmarsh zone and possibly the drier, sandy upland substrate that may be present above this zone. The reported elevation limit of the species is 4.5 meters (15 feet) MSL. It has been recorded in South Bay marshes and in the Delta.

Marsh Sandwort (*Arenaria paludicola*)

Marsh sandwort was listed by the CDFG as endangered in February 1990, and by the USFWS as endangered on August 3, 1993. It is a perennial, low-growing shrub in the pink family (Caryophyllaceae). The species has been observed most frequently in saltmarsh habitats and less frequently in freshwater marshes. It flowers between May and August. It has been found in the west Central Bay near the Golden Gate.

Other Sensitive Plant Species

Plant species considered sensitive by the CNPS but not on state or federal lists that occur in tidal marshes in San Francisco Estuary include Suisun marsh aster (*Aster lentus*), Delta tule pea (*Lathyrus jepsoni* var *jepsonii*), and Delta mudwort (*Limosella sublata*). Suisun marsh aster and Delta tule pea are CNPS 1B species and Delta

1 mudwort is a CNPS Category 2 species. Species designated as 1B by the CNPS are
2 plants that are rare, threatened or endangered in California or elsewhere. List 2 plants
3 are rare, threatened, or endangered in California but are more common elsewhere.

4
5 Suisun marsh aster occurs in brackish and freshwater marshes in Suisun Bay, the
6 western Delta, and Carquinez Strait (CDFG 2002). It was observed near the Shore
7 terminal pier during the 2002 reconnaissance survey of the project site. Delta tule pea
8 tule pea occurs in freshwater and brackish marshes, primarily in the Delta. It has been
9 recorded in a number of locations in Suisun Bay and Carquinez Strait (CDFG 2002).
10 Delta mudwort is found along the margins of channels and sloughs in the Delta area.
11 Within San Francisco Bay it has been recorded in Montezuma Slough (CDFG 2002).

12 13 Sensitive Fishes

14
15 Table 3.3-2 lists fish species in San Francisco Bay that appear on CDFG and/or
16 USFWS species lists as endangered, threatened, a candidate for endangered or
17 threatened, or a species of special concern.

18 19 River Lamprey (*Lampetra ayresi*)

20
21 River lampreys have been collected from large coastal streams from Alaska to
22 San Francisco Bay (Moyle 2002). They are most abundant in the Sacramento-
23 San Joaquin River systems but also occur in a number of other tributaries to
24 San Francisco Bay. River lampreys are anadromous, but apparently spend only 3 to
25 4 months in salt water. River lampreys feed on a variety of fishes, most commonly
26 herring and salmon. They typically attach to the back of the host fish where they feed
27 on muscle tissue. The river lamprey is a California Species of Special Concern.

28 29 Delta Smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*)

30
31 The Delta smelt is one of the few remaining native species found in the upper reaches
32 of San Francisco Bay and the Delta (Monroe and Kelly 1992). Its range extends from
33 around Isleton on the Sacramento River and Mossdale on the San Joaquin River
34 downstream to Suisun Bay. During periods of high river flow, some individuals are
35 washed into San Pablo Bay, but they do not establish permanent populations there.
36 Delta smelt are considered environmentally sensitive because they only live 1 year,
37 have a limited diet, and reside primarily in the interface between salt and fresh water.
38 The legally defined critical habitat of Delta smelt includes the Delta, Suisun Bay, and
39 Suisun Marsh.

40
41 Since 1980, the Delta smelt population has generally declined. Numbers of this species
42 now seem to be critically low. The Delta smelt has been listed as threatened by both
43 the federal government and the state of California.

44
45 After a period of extremely low populations throughout the 1980s, Delta smelt
46 abundance increased in 1993 to the sixth-highest recorded population index in a
47 28-year record. This increase apparently was in response to an increase in available
48 habitat brought about by a wet winter and spring, which ended a 7-year drought

Table 3.3-2
Special Status Fish Species of San Francisco Bay

Common Name/Scientific Name	Status		Habitat/Critical Habitat
	State	Federal	
River Lamprey <i>Lampetra ayresi</i>	CSC	--	Open water of Delta, Suisun Bay/NA
Delta smelt <i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	T	T	Open water of Delta, Suisun Bay/Suisun Bay into Delta
Longfin smelt <i>Spirinichus thaleichthys</i>	CSC	--	Open water of Bay and Delta/NA
Chinook salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> Winter run	E	E	Open water of Delta-nursery, migration; Bay-migration/San Francisco Bay north of San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge
Chinook salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> Spring run	T	T (Proposed E)	Open water of Delta-nursery, migration; Bay-migration/Under development
Chinook salmon <i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> Central Valley fall/late fall run	--	Proposed T	Open water of Delta-nursery, migration; Bay-migration/NA
Coho salmon <i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>	E	T	May be found in some tributary streams to the Bay/NA
Steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> Central California Coast ESU	--	T	Open water of Bay in migration, streams along San Francisco and San Pablo Basins/San Francisco Bay west of Golden Gate Bridge
Steelhead <i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> Central Valley ESU	--	T	Open water of Bay in migration, Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries/Under development
Tidewater goby <i>Eucyclogobius newberryi</i>	T	Delisted	Brackish water of lagoons and lower stream reaches/NA
Sacramento splittail <i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	CSC	T	Brackish and freshwater sloughs of lagoons of Delta Suisun Marsh, Suisun Bay/NA
Federal Status (determined by USFWS) E = Federally listed, endangered T = Federally listed, threatened State Status CSC = California Species of Special Concern T = State listed, threatened E = State listed, endangered			

(San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). In 1994, however, the Delta smelt population again declined to the low numbers recorded in the 1980s. Abundance rose again in 1995 to the seventh-highest index on record but again declined to historical lows in 1996, despite good habitat conditions in Suisun Bay. The 1997 Delta smelt abundance was low to average and 1998 was relatively low (CDFG 2000). In summary, from 1992 to 2000, numbers of Delta smelt were generally low but were within historical levels for most of those years (Moyle 2002). As of 1999, the CDFG listed the status of Delta smelt as stable to declining (CDFG 2000).

Longfin Smelt (*Sprinchus thaleichthys*)

Adult longfin smelt are broadly distributed throughout the Bay, but use the river channels of the Delta for spawning. Longfin smelt have definite seasonal migrations. They spend early summer in Central and San Pablo Bays, move into Suisun Bay in August and, in winter, congregate for spawning at the upper end of Suisun Bay and in the lower reaches of the Delta (Moyle and Yoshiyama 1992). Longfin smelt populations in San Francisco Bay have declined during the last decade. Although longfin smelt are widely distributed in Pacific coast bays and estuaries, only two populations are known from California: (1) in the San Francisco Bay estuary, and (2) in Humboldt Bay and the Eel River (Moyle and Yoshiyama 1992). Longfin smelt abundance in the San Francisco estuary reached an all-time low in 1992 following 6 years of drought (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). There is a strong positive relationship between freshwater outflow during the spawning and larval periods and the subsequent abundance of longfin smelt. Moderate outflow in 1993 resulted in a modest population rebound. In 1995, sufficient spawning stock and high outflow led to very good survival and returned the population to predrought abundance levels. Despite reasonably good outflow in 1995-1999 longfin smelt numbers remained fairly low when a stronger upward trend might have been expected (Moyle 2002). Voracious filtering of the base of the food web by the introduced Asian clam and the subsequent decline in the zooplankton prey of longfin smelt is probably a factor in the failure of the smelt population to increase substantially during the 1995 to 1999 wet period (Moyle 2002). Although population levels increased throughout the late 1990s with increased freshwater outflows, the longfin smelt population in San Francisco Estuary is not considered to be fully recovered (Sweetnam et al. 2001). The longfin smelt is both a federal and state species of concern.

Chinook Salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*)

After maturing in the ocean, adult Chinook salmon migrate through the San Francisco estuary to spawn in the streambed gravels of the Sacramento River and its tributaries and in the San Joaquin River tributaries (Monroe and Kelly 1992). There are four genetically distinct runs designated by the season in which they enter fresh water to spawn: a fall run that enters fresh water during July through November and begins spawning in October, a late-fall run that moves upstream during October through February and begins spawning in January, a winter run that moves upstream during January through June and begins spawning in April, and a spring run that moves upstream during March through July and begins spawning in August. Although the size of each of the four Chinook salmon runs has fluctuated since the mid-1960s, and although all four runs have declined in the 1980s, the Sacramento River winter run has exhibited the most steady decline. By 1991, fewer than 200 fish were estimated to return to the river to spawn in this run (Monroe and Kelly 1992). The winter run is considered to be at a critically low level and is listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act and as endangered under the California Endangered Species Act. The return of 1,361 winter-run fish in 1995 and 900 in 1996 was a significant increase over the 1994 all-time low of 189 fish (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). Spawning populations between 1998 and 2000 numbered between 1,400 and 3,200 fish indicating some recent recovery (Boydston et al. 2001).

1 The spring run has also declined markedly since the mid-1980s. The spring run of
2 Chinook salmon is listed as threatened by the state and federal governments and has
3 been proposed by the federal government for listing as endangered. Spring-run
4 abundance averaged 13,000 between 1967 and 1991, but recent populations in several
5 Sacramento River tributaries are at low levels (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).
6 Spawning populations increased during the late 1990's (Boydston et al. 2001).

7
8 The Central Valley fall/late fall run Evolutionarily Significant Unit (ESU) was proposed by
9 the federal government for listing as threatened in 1998. Sacramento fall-run Chinook
10 salmon remain the most abundant and ubiquitous Chinook stock, and the 1996 return of
11 212,000 was a significant increase over the previous 6 years (San Francisco Estuary
12 Project 1997). San Joaquin fall-run Chinook returns in 1996 remained far below the
13 1967-1991 average return of 21,000. Central Valley fall/late fall run abundance
14 increased significantly between 1996 and 2000 (Boydston et al. 2001).

15 16 Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*)

17
18 Coho salmon are widely distributed in streams along the Northern and Central California
19 coast (Moyle and Yoshiyama 1992). In California, principal populations are found in the
20 Klamath, Trinity, Mad, Noyo, and Eel Rivers, as well as in smaller coastal streams south
21 to Scott Creek and Waddell Creek in Santa Cruz County. Currently, there are probably
22 less than 5,000 wild Coho salmon spawning in California each year, and many
23 populations have fewer than 100 individuals. The decline in Coho salmon is probably
24 related to a number of factors, including the degradation of coastal streams, the
25 catastrophic effects of floods and drought on an already declining population, the
26 introgression of genetic integrity by planting of hatchery fish, introduced diseases, and
27 overharvesting. Coho salmon are principally found outside the San Francisco Bay
28 estuary, but small numbers may be found in the San Francisco estuary tributary
29 streams (Herbold et al. 1991). There was a small population using Corte Madera
30 Creek, but it is believed to be gone now (Moyle 2002). A 1994 – 1997 survey of native
31 fishes in streams of the San Francisco estuary did not collect any Coho salmon (San
32 Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

33 34 Steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) – Central California Coast ESU, Central Valley ESU

35
36 Steelhead are anadromous rainbow trout, hatching in fresh water, descending to the
37 sea, and returning to fresh water to spawn. The Central California Coast ESU was
38 listed as threatened by the federal government in 1997. This ESU includes coastal
39 basins from the Russian River south to Soquel Creek, and streams of the San
40 Francisco and San Pablo Bay Basins. The Central Valley ESU was listed as threatened
41 by the federal government in 1998. This ESU includes steelhead that spawn in the
42 Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries.

43
44 Currently, small steelhead runs occur in the South Bay in San Francisquito Creek,
45 Steven's Creek, the Guadalupe River, Coyote Creek, and Permanente Creek; in the
46 East Bay, possibly in Alameda and San Lorenzo Creeks; in the Central Bay in Corte
47 Madera, Miller, Arroya Corte Madera Del Presidio, and Novato Creeks; and in the North

1 Bay in the Petaluma River, Sonoma Creek, and the Napa River drainage (San Francisco
2 Estuary Project 1997). Steelhead may still occur in Wildcat Creek and the Pinole River
3 in southeast San Pablo Bay. Tributaries to Suisun Bay that support steelhead runs
4 include the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and Green Valley, and Suisun and
5 Walnut Creeks. Steelhead adults and juveniles may be found foraging in and migrating
6 through estuarine subtidal and riverine tidal habitats within all areas of the San Francisco
7 estuary.

8 9 Tidewater Goby (*Eucyclogobius newberryi*)

10
11 The tidewater goby is endemic to California and lives in the brackish water habitats from
12 Southern California to the Smith River, Del Norte County (Moyle et al. 1989). This
13 species is found in shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches where the water is
14 brackish (salinities usually less than 10 ppt) to fresh. In the past, tidewater gobies were
15 distributed in brackish water habitats around Central Bay and San Pablo Bay. However,
16 in San Francisco Bay and associated streams, at least 9 out of 10 previously identified
17 populations have disappeared, and a 1984 survey of streams of the Bay drainages did
18 not record any populations (Moyle et al. 1989). A 1994 to 1997 survey of San Francisco
19 estuary streams also failed to record any tidewater gobies (San Francisco Estuary
20 Project 1997). The tidewater goby is listed by California as a threatened species. The
21 tidewater goby population north of Orange County was proposed for delisting by the
22 federal government in 1999.

23 24 Sacramento Splittail (*Pogonichthys macrolepidotus*)

25
26 The Sacramento splittail is a California Central Valley endemic and was once distributed
27 in lakes and rivers throughout the Central Valley (Moyle et al. 1989). Splittail are now
28 largely confined to the Delta, Suisun Bay, Suisun Marsh, Napa Marsh, the lower
29 Petaluma River, and other parts of the Sacramento-San Joaquin estuary (Moyle 2002).
30 Suisun Marsh has a particularly high concentration of splittail. Splittail are primarily
31 freshwater fish but they can tolerate moderate salinities and can live in water with
32 salinities as high as 10 to 12 ppt. The abundance of this species in the Delta system is
33 strongly tied to outflows because spawning occurs over flooded vegetation. About a
34 month of flooding during the spring spawning period is necessary for incubation, growth,
35 and successful larval emigration from floodplains. When outflows are high, reproductive
36 success is high; when outflows are low, reproduction may fail. Splittail abundance in the
37 San Francisco estuary was poor through most of the drought but improved substantially
38 in 1995 and again in 1998 when good outflow conditions led to very large year classes
39 (Moyle 2002). The Sacramento splittail is federal threatened and a California Species
40 of Special Concern.

41 42 **Sensitive Birds, Mammals, Reptiles, and Amphibians**

43
44 There are 38 listed species of birds, 6 species of mammals, and 5 species of
45 amphibians or reptiles that occur or have occurred in habitats vulnerable to oil spills
46 (Table 3.3-3). Oil spills or other impacts would be most damaging to these species
47 because they already have small or isolated populations persisting in an altered

Table 3.3-3
Species of Birds, Mammals, Reptiles, and Amphibians of Special Status on
Federal and State Lists that Inhabit Open Waters, Rocky Shore, Mudflats, and/or
Tidal Marshlands of the San Francisco Bay Estuary

Common Name/Scientific Name	Status*		Habitat/Critical Habitat
	State	Federal	
Birds			
Common loon <i>Gavis immer</i>	CSC	--	Open water
American white pelican <i>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</i>	CSC	--	Open water
California brown pelican <i>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</i>	SE	FE	Open water
Double-crested cormorant <i>Phalacrocorax auritis</i>	CSC	--	Open water, rocky shore, tidal marshes
Least bittern <i>Ixobrychus exilis</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
White-faced ibis <i>Plegadis chihi</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Aleutian Canada goose <i>Branta canadensis kucoparcia</i>	--	FT	Open water, tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Fulvous whistling duck <i>Dendrocygna bicolor</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish marshes
Barrow's goldeneye <i>bucephala islandica</i>	CSC	--	Open water and tidal brackish marshes
Osprey <i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	CSC	--	Open water
Northern harrier <i>Circus cyaneus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
Sharp-shinned hawk <i>Accipiter striatus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Cooper's hawk <i>Accipter cooperii</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Ferruginous hawk <i>Buteo regalis</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Bald eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	SE	--	Open water, tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Golden eagle <i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
Merlin <i>Falco columbarius</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
American peregrine falcon <i>Falco peregrinus anatum</i>	SE	--	Tidal marshes
Prairie falcon <i>Falco mexicanus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal freshwater marshes
Yellow rail <i>Coturnicops noveboracensis</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
California black rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis conturniculus</i>	ST	--	Tidal saltmarshes
California clapper rail <i>Rallus longirostris obsoletus</i>	SE	FE	Tidal saltmarshes
Greater sandhill crane <i>Grus Canadensis tabida</i>	ST	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Western snowy plover <i>Charadruis alexandrinus nivosa</i>	CSC	FT	Intertidal mudflat

Table 3.3-3 (Continued)
Species of Birds, Mammals, Reptiles, and Amphibians of Special Status on
Federal and State Lists that Inhabit Open Waters, Rocky Shore, Mudflats, and/or
Tidal Marshlands of the San Francisco Bay Estuary

Common Name/Scientific Name	Status*		Habitat/Critical Habitat
	State	Federal	
Long-billed curlew <i>Numerius americanus</i>	CSC	--	Intertidal mud, tidal marshes
California gull <i>Larus californicus</i>	CSC	--	Open water, intertidal mud, tidal marshes
Elegant tern <i>Sterna elegans</i>	CSC	--	Open water, rocky shore, intertidal mudflat
California least tern <i>Sterna antillarum browni</i>	SE	FE	Open water, tidal saltmarshes
Marbled murrelet <i>Brachyramphus marmoratus</i>	SE	FE	Open water
Burrowing owl <i>Athene cunicularia</i>	CSC	--	Tidal salt/brackish marshes
Long-eared owl <i>Asio otus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes/upland grass lands
Short-eared owl <i>Asio flammeus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
Black swift <i>Cypseloides niger</i>	CSC	--	Rocky shore
Saltmarsh common yellowthroat <i>Geothlypis trichas sinuosa</i>	CSC	--	Tidal saltmarshes
Alameda song sparrow <i>Melospiza melodia pusillula</i>	CSC	--	Tidal saltmarshes
Suisun song sparrow <i>Melospiza melodia maxillaris</i>	CSC	--	Tidal saltmarshes
San Pablo song sparrow <i>Melospiza melodia samuelis</i>	CSC	--	Tidal saltmarshes
Tricolored blackbird <i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish/freshwater marshes
Mammals			
Saltmarsh wandering shrew <i>Sorex vagran halicoetes</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
Suisun ornate shrew <i>Sorex ornatus sinuosus</i>	CSC	--	Tidal marshes
Saltmarsh harvest mouse <i>Reithrodontomys raviventris</i>	SE	FE	Tidal salt/brackish marshes
San Pablo vole <i>Microtus californicus sanpabloensis</i>	CSC	--	Tidal brackish marshes
Humpback whale <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	--	FE	Open water
California Amphibians			
Tiger salamander <i>Ambystoma tigrinum</i>	CSC	--	Freshwater and brackish marshes
California red-legged frog <i>Rana aurora draytoni</i>	CSC	FT	Tidal freshwater marshes
Reptiles			
San Francisco garter snake <i>Thamnophis sirtalis</i>	SE	FE	Tidal freshwater marshes
Western pond turtle <i>Clemmys marmorata</i>	CSC	--	Tidal freshwater marshes

Table 3.3-3 (Continued)
Species of Birds, Mammals, Reptiles, and Amphibians of Special Status on
Federal and State Lists that Inhabit Open Waters, Rocky Shore, Mudflats, and/or
Tidal Marshlands of the San Francisco Bay Estuary

*Federal Status (determined by USFWS)

E = Federally listed, endangered

T = Federally listed, threatened

State Status

CSC = California Species of Special Concern

T = State listed, threatened

E = State listed, endangered

Source: Code of Federal Regulations, Title 50, Parts 17.11 and 17.12 (April 15, 1990) and Annual Notices of Review; USFWS Sensitive Bird Species List; USFWS Migratory Nongame Birds of Management Concern List; CDFG Natural Diversity Data Base, Special Animals, 2002.

environment. Because these species are rare, information on their distribution is often limited to records of sightings at scattered locations. The current status of those species that require or are restricted to open water, rocky shore, intertidal mudflats, or tidal marshes is further described.

Birds

The following species of rare/threatened/endangered birds may be most susceptible to contact by oil spills because of their foraging habits, reliance on intertidal mudflats and tidal saltmarshes for nesting habitat, use of open water, or the known impacts from previous oil spills.

Common Loon (*Gavis immer*)

The common loon's breeding habitat in the western states is limited to Idaho. Winter visitors to San Francisco Bay are found in deeper open water areas.

American White Pelican (*Pelecanus erythrorhynchos*)

The American white pelican is a late summer/fall migrant through the area and a winter visitor. The species nests in large inland lakes in the western states and Canada; only remnant colonies exist in California in the Klamath Basin and Honey Lake area. During fall and winter, white pelicans are locally common in large open water areas, including salt ponds.

California Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*)

The California brown pelican breeds in the spring on islands of the Southern California Bight and Mexico. Following the breeding season, brown pelicans migrate northward. The species reaches its peak abundance in central California in August through September (Briggs et al. 1983). In the Bay, brown pelicans forage over deep open water and roost on many breakwaters and piers and, occasionally, on salt-pond dikes.

1 Double-Crested Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auritis*)

2
3 This species nests in the San Francisco Bay Area, predominantly on bridges, towers,
4 and other man-made structures. The colony breeding on the San Francisco-Oakland
5 Bridge numbered 465 pairs in 1990, making it the second largest in the state. The
6 cormorant population on the Bay Bridge saw a 71 percent increase from 1990-1999
7 (American Segmental Bridge Institute 2002). The large colony on the Richmond-
8 San Rafael Bridge had 424 breeding pairs in 1990. In 2000, the Richmond-San Rafael
9 Bridge Colony fledged 433 chicks (Rauzon 2000). Smaller nesting colonies are found
10 at a variety of other sites throughout the Bay (Carter et al. 1992).

11
12 California Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis conturniculus*)

13
14 The California black rail's habitat of tidal marshes has been greatly reduced and
15 fragmented. The species currently breeds only in San Pablo Bay, Suisun Bay, and the
16 lower Delta. Highest densities of California black rails occur in the Petaluma River
17 Wildlife Management Area, along Black John and Fagan sloughs and Coon Island in the
18 Napa marsh, and in tidal marshes along the shore of San Pablo Bay. This secretive
19 species requires tidal marshes that include higher elevational zones not subject to
20 extreme and frequent tidal action (USFWS 1992). Black rails tend to occur in the larger
21 undiked marshes associated with larger rivers and in some bayshore parcels,
22 particularly those associated with the mouths of rivers and creeks (Nur et al. 1997).
23 Black rail populations in the Bay region have not decreased since 1986 (San Francisco
24 Estuary Project 1997). Black rail surveys in 2001 resulted in population estimates of
25 approximately 15,000 black rails in San Pablo Bay and 12,000 black rails in Suisun Bay
26 (Spautz and Nur 2002). In the 2001 survey, the most rails were heard in San Pablo Bay
27 at Day Island, Black John Slough and nearby Greenpoint Centennial Marsh, Petaluma
28 Marsh and Lower Tubbs Island muted marsh, and in Suisun Bay at Benicia State Park
29 and Rush Ranch. A moderate number of black rails were detected at China Camp,
30 Corte Madera Ecological Marsh, Petaluma Rivermouth, Pond 2A, Fagan Slough, Pt.
31 Pinole, San Pablo Creek Marsh, and in Suisun Bay at Peyton Slough, Hill Slough and
32 Grey Goose. Black rails appear to be absent in Central and South Bays.

33
34 California Clapper Rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*)

35
36 The California clapper rail is a year-round resident in the San Francisco Bay area where
37 it continues to suffer severe habitat loss due to human encroachment on tidal marshes
38 and predation by red foxes. Preferred habitat is characterized by close proximity to tidal
39 flow (habitat traversed by tidal sloughs), and cover of pickleweed with extensive stands
40 of Pacific cordgrass at lower elevations and gumplant and wrack at higher elevations.
41 California clapper rails feed on mollusks in mud-bottomed sloughs near cover. The
42 population in the San Francisco Bay Area from 1981-1987 was estimated at only about
43 1,500 birds (Harvey 1988), but declined to fewer than 500 in 1991 (USFWS 1992). The
44 population has rebounded somewhat to about 1,200 in recent years (San Francisco
45 Estuary Project 1997, CDFG 2002). Based on winter counts from 1996 to 1997, the
46 South Bay population was estimated to be 500 to 600 birds and the North Bay
47 population to be a similar size (CDFG 2000). Distribution of California clapper rail
48 habitat from Gill (1979) is shown on Figure 3.3-2.

1 **Figure 3.3-2 Clapper Rail Habitat in San Francisco Bay**

1 California Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*)

2
3 The California least tern was listed as endangered on federal and state lists in 1970
4 because of its small population on drastically reduced nesting habitat. In the Bay Area,
5 the species currently has major nesting effort only at Alameda Naval Air Station and
6 Oakland International Airport in Alameda County. However, peripheral sites also exist
7 where sporadic nesting effort occurs. These sites may be used in 1 year and not the
8 next, but have the potential to become important new colonies (Chambers Group 1994).
9 A PG&E cooling pond in Pittsburg has supported at least two to four pairs in recent
10 years (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). In 2000, this colony supported 15 pair.

11
12 In 1996 a total of 208 pairs of least terns nested at the Alameda Naval Air Station site
13 and fledged 233 young (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). This nesting effort was
14 up from 150 pair and 73 young fledged in 1995. In 2000, approximately 300 pair
15 fledged between 200 and 230 young. The Oakland International Airport tern colony has
16 experienced problems in recent years. No nesting occurred from 1992 to 1994 or in
17 1996 and all of the 1995 nests failed (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). One
18 reason may be predation by the non-native red fox. California least terns forage near
19 their colonies in eelgrass beds where they are vulnerable to oil spills.

20
21 Western Snowy Plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*)

22
23 In San Francisco Bay, snowy plovers nest almost exclusively on levees and islands of
24 salt ponds and in dry salt ponds of the south Bay (Warriner et al. 1986). A survey in
25 June 1978 resulted in a count of 351 adult birds, but subsequent June counts have
26 been lower (Page and Stenzel 1981; USFWS 1992). Almost all snowy plover nesting
27 occurs in the South Bay. The winter population of snowy plovers numbers at least
28 350 birds, most of which are found in the vicinity of salt ponds in the Baumberg area of
29 the South Bay (Page et al. 1986). At any time of year, snowy plovers foraging on
30 intertidal mudflats are vulnerable to impacts of oil spills reaching the South Bay. The
31 CNDDDB lists western snowy plovers as occurring in San Mateo County near Belmont
32 and Redwood City, and at Bair Island in Alameda County near Hayward (CDFG 2002).

33
34 Long-Billed Curlew (*Numenius americanus*)

35
36 Long-billed curlews are a wintering shorebird in California and do not breed in the
37 San Francisco Bay Area. They are most abundant in the fall and winter and their
38 numbers decline in the spring when they are on their northern breeding grounds.

39
40 American Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus anatum*)

41
42 Peregrine falcons in the San Francisco Bay and Delta prey to some extent on terns,
43 shorebirds, and seabirds. In this part of their range, they forage predominantly in
44 wetlands surrounding the Bay. Because of the possibility of ingestion of oil-
45 contaminated prey or scavenged carcasses, the peregrine falcon and other raptors are
46 at risk of oil spills.

Mammals

Suisun Ornate Shrew (*Sorex ornatus sinuosus*)

The Suisun shrew is an inhabitant of tidal marshes of northern San Pablo and Suisun Bays and, historically, ranged as far east as Grizzly Island and as far west as the mouth of Sonoma Creek, the Petaluma River, and Tubbs Island (Western Ecological Services Company 1986b, as cited in USFWS 1992). The species currently may be found only on Grizzly Island (Williams 1983). Suisun shrews inhabit the middle-to-high marsh elevations where deposited litter and driftwood provide shelter and forage. An important adjunct of habitat is that higher upland areas exist where animals can move during extreme high tides. While some tidal marshes in San Pablo Bay exist with access to higher marshland vegetation, most are broken into small, isolated units with little elevational gradient. Diked marshes may provide suitable cover for these shrews and are more available in Suisun Marsh than elsewhere (Western Ecological Services Company 1986b, cited in USFWS 1992). The CNDDDB lists occurrences at Lake Chabot, Sears Point Road northwest of Vallejo, Southampton Bay in Solano County, Suisun City saltmarsh, near Cordelia salt marsh, near Napa River and Highway 37, near White Slough and Highway 37, South and Dutchmans Sloughs, and at Mare Island Naval Shipyard at the mouth of Carquinez Strait (CDFG2002).

Saltmarsh Wandering Shrew (*Sorex vagran halicoetes*)

This species prefers tidal salt marshes with dense cover of pickleweed and sufficient driftwood to provide soil moisture adequate for habitat and invertebrate food resources. It is apparently limited to the southern San Francisco Bay where it inhabits marshes 2 to 3 m above the high water line (Findley 1955). For the purposes of this EIR, the current distribution is defined by past records of observations and captures, including marshes of Santa Clara, Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, and San Francisco Counties (Williams 1986). The CNDDDB lists occurrences in the saltmarsh at the west approach to the Dumbarton Bridge, on Bair Island near Redwood Point, in Alameda Creek, at Giant Marsh in Contra Costa County, in San Pablo Creek saltmarsh north of Richmond, at Arrowhead (Melrose) Marsh north of Oakland Airport, at Oakland Airport, at Ravenswood Point in San Mateo County, and at Johnson and Hayward Landings in Alameda County.

Saltmarsh Harvest Mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*)

The saltmarsh harvest mouse is endemic to salt and brackish marshes where its preferred habitat is the higher tidal wetlands that provide access, if necessary, to refugia during extreme high tides (USFWS 1992). The preferred habitat is typically dominated by pickleweed, along with a diverse mixture of vegetation characterizing the transition zone. Saltmarsh harvest mice are also able to use diked marshes and adjacent grasslands during the late spring. Two subspecies exist in the area: the northern, inhabiting San Pablo and Suisun Bays, and the southern, inhabiting central and southern San Francisco Bay. Currently, suitable habitat is only about 5 percent of that

historically available, and conservation of the species focuses on habitat protection and restoration. The CNDDDB lists occurrences at many sites in saline emergent wetlands of Solano, Contra Costa, Alameda, San Mateo, Marin, Sonoma, and Napa Counties.

San Pablo Vole (*Microtus californicus sanpabloensis*)

San Pablo vole populations are found in three widely isolated fragments in saltmarshes along the south shore of San Pablo Bay in Contra Costa County (Western Ecological Services Company 1986c, cited in USFWS 1992). The CNDDDB indicates occurrences in Giant Marsh and adjacent grasslands, San Pablo Creek and associated saltmarsh, and Wildcat Creek and marsh at creek mouth (CDFG 2002).

Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)

The humpback whale is a federally listed endangered species that feeds in the Gulf of the Farallones in the fall. One individual entered San Francisco Bay in October 1985 and again in October 1990 ("Humphrey"). Sightings of individual whales have been made regularly near the mouth of the Bay (Chambers Group 1994).

Amphibians and Reptiles

The amphibian and reptile fauna of the brackish and freshwater marshes in the San Francisco Bay region includes five species that are listed as rare/threatened/endangered (or candidate) or California Species of Special Concern (Table 3.3-3). While all may use tidal marshes as habitat, they are not limited to marshes nor are they necessarily present wherever that habitat-type occurs. Because of their rarity, distributional data are limited.

California Tiger Salamander (*Ambystoma tigrinum*)

This species may typically be out of reach of oil spills; found in some brackish freshwater marshes, it more commonly occurs at higher elevations. For survival, it requires vernal pools for breeding and access to rodent burrows for hibernation and estivation (dormant period during the summer) (citations in USFWS 1992). The CNDDDB lists its present range to include San Francisquito Creek in San Mateo County.

California Red-Legged Frog (*Rana aurora draytoni*)

The California red-legged frog is rare in the San Francisco Bay region, and has only a few relict populations in surrounding coastal mountains and the Delta. It prefers fresh and brackish marshes and riparian habitats. In the San Francisco Bay region, red-legged frogs are present in the Santa Cruz Mountains, the San Francisco State Fish and Game Refuge in San Mateo County, in canals at the San Francisco International Airport, and in northern Contra Costa County at the Concord Naval Weapons Station, Marsh and Kellogg Creeks, and in the Los Vaqueros area (citations in USFWS 1992). The CDFG Natural Diversity Database also indicates occurrence in Golden Gate Park, the Presidio, and other sites near the city of San Francisco. The USFWS is in the process of designating critical habitat for the California red-legged frog.

San Francisco Garter Snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis*)

The San Francisco subspecies of the common garter snake is listed as endangered (by both the federal and state alternatives). It is known to occur in tidal, (brackish) freshwater marshes but may be more common at higher elevations. It has been recorded in recent years in the San Francisco State Fish and Game Refuge (San Mateo County), near Crystal Springs Reservoir, Sharp Park Golf Course in Pacifica, Mori Point, Cascade Ranch, Sanchez Canyon in Hillsborough, San Francisco International Airport, and in irrigation ponds along the San Mateo coast (USFWS 1992, CDFG 2002).

Western Pond Turtle (*Clemmys marmorata*)

Habitat requirements of the western pond turtle include backwater areas with abundant vegetation, logs for basking, and open sunny slopes well away from riparian zones for egg deposition (USFWS 1992).

3.3.2.3 Project Area

Introduction

This section describes in detail the tidally influenced biological resources of the project area. The project area extends from the Caquinez Bridge (Interstate 80) to just west of Pittsburg and encompasses Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay. The biological resources subject to tidal inundation within this area would be more vulnerable to an oil spill from operations at the Shore marine terminal than resources located elsewhere in the estuary.

Carquinez Strait is the narrow passage that joins San Pablo Bay on the west to Suisun Bay on the east. The 12-mile long Strait is characterized by deep water habitat (mean depth 29 feet) and a variable salinity regime related to fluctuations in freshwater flow from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system (Corps, EPA, BCDC, RWQCB and SWRCB 1998).

Suisun Bay is the northeasternmost embayment of San Francisco Estuary. Suisun Bay covers approximately 36 square miles, has a mean depth of 14 feet, and a mean salinity of approximately 7 parts per thousand (ppt) (Corps, EPA, BCDC, RWQCB and SWRCB 1998). Freshwater flowing from the Delta usually meets saltwater from the ocean in the vicinity of Suisun Bay. The entrapment zone of high productivity and ecological importance to many species in the estuary usually is located in Suisun Bay.

Plankton

Historically, Suisun Bay was characterized by high concentrations of phytoplankton (Davis 1982). The Suisun Bay phytoplankton assemblage was dominated by freshwater forms in the winter during periods of high river outflow and by more marine forms, particularly diatoms, during the summer. Peaks in phytoplankton abundance, as

1 measured by chlorophyll *a* concentrations, tend to coincide with the turbidity maximum
2 or entrainment zone, which usually is located near the 2 ppt isohaline. Prior to the late
3 1980s a diatom bloom occurred in Suisun Bay in summer (July and August) that
4 coincided with the landward movement of marine waters. Peak abundances of
5 invertebrate zooplankton including the copepod *Eurytemora affinis* and the mysid
6 *Neomysis mercedis*, as well as juvenile and larval fishes, appear to correlate with the
7 phytoplankton maximum in the entrainment zone (Kimmerer et al. 1998). It's thought
8 that these organisms have behavioral adaptations to maintain their position in this area
9 of high food abundance (Kimmerer 1998, Bennett 1998).

10
11 In recent years, the plankton assemblages of Suisun Bay have changed considerably
12 as a result of introduction of the Asian clam and, to a lesser extent, reduced Delta
13 outflows and direct competition with introduced species. In Suisun Bay, grazing by the
14 Asian clam is suspected of having an overriding influence on phytoplankton biomass,
15 species composition and size structure (Lehman 1998). Since its introduction in 1987,
16 the Asian clam has lowered chlorophyll *a* concentrations in Suisun Bay by a factor of
17 10. Its ability to remove phytoplankton in channels is a function of high densities that
18 may exceed 6,000 clams per square meter in drought years and high grazing rates that
19 enable it to filter all the water in 10 meter deep channels 1.28 times per day (Lehman
20 1998). This voracious filtration appears to have reduced the abundance of diatoms,
21 which have a large diameter, and led to the proliferation of small green and bluegreen
22 algae that may persist because they are ineffectively grazed by the Asian clam, which
23 cannot retain very small particles. These very small types of phytoplankton provide
24 inferior food for native zooplankton species, which have decreased since the
25 introduction of the Asian clam.

26
27 In addition, to the loss of phytoplankton by grazing of the Asian clam, decreases in
28 phytoplankton abundance in Suisun Bay may be related to variations in river flows
29 (Jassby et al. 1996). Phytoplankton production is greatest when the entrainment zone is
30 over the expansive shoals of Suisun Bay where light levels are high. When river flows
31 are too high or too low the entrainment zone is positioned in deep turbid channels
32 upstream or downstream of these shoals and growth rates are low due to lower light
33 levels.

34
35 Changes in phytoplankton biomass, community composition and cell diameter in Suisun
36 Bay may degrade the food web of San Francisco Estuary, because they affect copepod
37 food quantity and quality (Lehman 1998). These changes in quantity and quality of
38 phytoplankton food may have contributed to some of the long-term shifts in copepod
39 species composition and distribution. Densities of the larger copepods have decreased
40 and densities of smaller introduced copepod species have increased. These changes
41 in phytoplankton may have added to the stresses on the declining copepod species
42 *Eurytemora affinis*, which also is thought to have declined because of direct filtering by
43 the Asian clam.

44
45 As discussed in the previous section, the opossum shrimp *Neomysis mercedis*, an
46 important food organism for juvenile fishes, has declined in the last two decades. Food
47 limitation because of the reduced phytoplankton concentrations is thought to be the

primary reason for the decline (Orsi and Mecum 1996). Competition for food by two introduced Asian mysid shrimp also may hamper the recovery of the native mysid population.

Benthos

The San Francisco Estuary Institute Regional Monitoring Program Benthic Pilot Study sampled benthic invertebrate communities throughout San Francisco Estuary between 1994 and 1997 (Thompson et al. 2000). The study identified three major benthic invertebrate assemblages in the estuary related to the relative amount of marine and freshwater influences: the marine assemblage, the estuarine assemblage, and the fresh-brackish assemblage. The project area was characterized by an assemblage of benthic organisms that was dominated by estuarine species (main estuarine sub-assemblage) and by a sub-assemblage that was transitional between the estuarine assemblage and the fresh-brackish assemblage.

The Benthic Pilot Study had a station (D6) just west of the mouth of Pacheco Creek approximately 1 mile east of the Shore terminal pier. It was sampled 23 times in 1996 and 1997 (Thompson et al. 2000). The number of invertebrate taxa ranged from 2 to 9 per sample. The invertebrate assemblage shifted from main estuarine to estuarine transition depending on the amount of freshwater flow. The main estuarine assemblage is strongly dominated by the Asian clam. An introduced tube building amphipod, *Ampelisca abdita*, also was abundant in this sub-assemblage. The estuarine transition sub-assemblage, like the marine estuarine assemblage, is characterized by the Asian clam, but also includes species characteristic of the fresh-brackish assemblage like the polychaete worm, *Marenzelleria viridis*, and the amphipod *Gammarus daiberi*.

The CDFG samples fishes and invertebrates by otter trawl and midwater trawl throughout San Francisco Bay (Baxter et al. 1999). Station 432 is located on the south side of Suisun Bay west of the mouth of Pacheco Creek, not far from the Shore terminal pier. Table 3.3-4 shows epibenthic invertebrates collected by otter trawl at this station between 1996 and 2000. The most abundant epibenthic invertebrates were California bay shrimp and oriental shrimp. Blacktail bay shrimp, Dungeness crab, and the invasive Chinese mitten crab (*Eriocheir sinensis*) were also caught at this station.

Table 3.3-4
Invertebrate Species Collected by Otter Trawl at Station # 432 from 1996-2000

Common Name	Invertebrate Species	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
blacktail bay shrimp	<i>Crangon nigricauda</i>	46	40	31	0	221
California bay shrimp	<i>Crangon franciscorum</i>	15,310	28,141	44,028	12,066	12,266
Chinese mitten crab*	<i>Eriocheir sinensis</i>	0	8	19	52	28
Dungeness crab	<i>Cancer magister</i>	3	19	0	16	18
oriental shrimp*	<i>Palaemon macrodactylus</i>	231	775	721	233	224
*Introduced species						
Source: Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary and California Department of Fish and Game's San Francisco Bay Study 2003						

1 Earlier data on benthic invertebrates in the project area are generally consistent with the
2 more recent information. In 1990, Entrix took grab samples of benthic invertebrates at
3 three transects located west of the mouth of Peyton Slough relatively close to the Shore
4 terminal pier (Entrix 1991). The Asian clam was the most abundant species in the
5 samples. The polychaete *Streblospio benedicti* and the cumacean *Leucon subnasica*
6 were the two next most abundant species respectively. They also collected fishes and
7 epibenthic invertebrates by otter trawl. The trawls collected crangonid and oriental
8 shrimp.

9
10 During the 1990 study, Entrix also collected invertebrates by grab sample at three
11 stations within Peyton Slough and at one station in the mudflat at the mouth of Peyton
12 Slough (Entrix 1991). Twenty taxa of benthic invertebrates were collected at the four
13 stations. The most abundant species in the slough was the introduced estuarine worm
14 *Streblospio benedicti*. The Asian clam dominated the mudflat station at the mouth of
15 the slough. The Asian clam accounted for 94 percent of the total catch in the mudflat
16 but comprised a relatively low portion of the animals collected within the slough.

17
18 Dungeness crabs are fairly common in Suisun Bay during years with low freshwater
19 outflow (Baxter et al. 1999). The introduced Chinese mitten crab has become abundant
20 in the project area in recent years. Shore workers who fish from the Shore Terminals
21 pier report collecting large numbers of this invasive species.

22 23 Fishes

24
25 This Section describes the characteristics of the fish assemblages in Carquinez Strait
26 and Suisun Bay. Important non-sensitive fish species of the project area are then
27 discussed in greater detail. Sensitive fish species were discussed in the previous
28 section above.

29 30 Characteristics of the Project Area

31
32 The project area is important to many sensitive fish species as well as to several
33 species of interest to fishermen. Carquinez Strait is an important migratory corridor for
34 many fish species including striped bass, Chinook salmon, American shad, steelhead,
35 Sacramento splittail, Pacific herring, northern anchovy, white sturgeon and longfin
36 smelt. During periods of strong Delta outflow, fresh and brackish water species more
37 characteristic of Suisun Bay move downstream through Carquinez Strait into San Pablo
38 Bay (Baxter et al. 1999). During periods of low freshwater flows marine species move
39 up into Suisun Bay.

40
41 Suisun Bay supports a unique fish assemblage as a result of the decreased salinity and
42 the network of sloughs along the edges. Species characteristic of Suisun Bay include
43 longfin smelt, Delta smelt, Pacific staghorn sculpin (*Leptocottus armatus*), northern
44 anchovy, starry flounder (*Platichthys stellatus*) as well as such introduced species as
45 striped bass, American shad, and yellowfin goby (*Acanthogobius flavimanus*). The
46 annual success of a number of fish species is tied to the amount of low salinity water in
47 Suisun Bay as measured by the position of the 2 ppt bottom salinity isohaline

(Moyle 2002). The farther downstream the iohaline, the more likely the young of freshwater and brackish water fishes to have high survival rates. Unfortunately the value of Suisun Bay as a nursery area has been compromised by not only the Asian clam but also invasions of non-indigenous copepods, amphipods, shrimp, crabs and fishes (Moyle 2002).

As mentioned above, the CDFG samples fishes and invertebrates by otter trawl and midwater trawl throughout San Francisco Bay (Baxter et al. 1999). Station 432 is located on the south side of Suisun Bay in the general vicinity of the Shore Terminals pier. Tables 3.3-5 and 3.3-6 show fishes collected at these stations since 1996. The most abundant fishes caught in otter trawls since 1996 were Pacific staghorn sculpin, striped bass, yellowfin goby, and longfin smelt (CDFG 2003). Between 1996 and 2001, 2 Chinook salmon, 1 Delta smelt, and 2 Sacramento splittail were caught in otter trawls at this station. The most abundant fish species caught in midwater trawls were longfin smelt, striped bass, and northern anchovy. Between 1996 and 2001, 20 Chinook salmon, 7 Delta smelt, and 25 Sacramento splittail were caught in the midwater trawls.

Table 3.3-5
Total Number of Each Fish Species Collected by
Otter Trawl at Station # 432 from 1996-2001

Common Name	Fish Species	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
American shad*	<i>Alosa sapidissima</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
arrow goby	<i>Clevelandia ios</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1
bay goby	<i>Lepidogobius lepidus</i>	1	11	0	11	0	3
California halibut	<i>Paralichthys californicus</i>	0	0	0	1	0	0
chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	0	0	1	0	0	1
delta smelt	<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
inland silverside*	<i>Menidia beryllina</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
longfin smelt	<i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	7	4	15	39	6	4
Pacific lamprey	<i>Lampetra tridentate</i>	0	0	0	0	0	2
Pacific staghorn sculpin	<i>Leptocottus armatus</i>	30	28	15	50	22	27
Pacific tomcod	<i>Microgadus proximus</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0
plainfin midshipman	<i>Porichthys notatus</i>	3	8	0	3	0	18
prickly sculpin	<i>Cottus asper</i>	0	0	3	0	0	0
river lamprey	<i>Lampetra ayresi</i>	0	2	0	1	4	1
shimofuri goby*	<i>Tridentiger bifasciatus</i>	7	1	2	1	0	0
Shokihaze goby*	<i>Tridentiger barbatus</i>	0	0	1	3	14	12
speckled sanddab	<i>Citharichthys stigmaeus</i>	4	8	0	0	0	1
Splittail	<i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	1	0	0	0	1	0
starry flounder	<i>Platichthys stellatus</i>	4	10	6	3	0	0
striped bass*	<i>Morone saxatilis</i>	20	6	9	15	6	18
threespine stickleback	<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>	1	0	1	0	0	0
white catfish*	<i>Ameiurus catus</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
white sturgeon	<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
whitebait smelt	<i>Allosmerus elongates</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
yellowfin goby*	<i>Acanthogobius flavimanus</i>	6	3	10	19	19	9

* Introduced species

Source: Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary and California Department of Fish and Game's San Francisco Bay Study (CDFG 2003).

Table 3.3-6
Fish Species Collected by Midwater Trawl at Station # 432 from 1996-2001

Common Name	Fish Species	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
American shad*	<i>Alosa sapidissima</i>	9	27	6	5	17	29
bay goby	<i>Lepidogobius lepidus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1
chinook salmon	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>	4	2	2	4	2	6
common carp*	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	0	0	0	0	0	5
delta smelt	<i>Hypomesus transpacificus</i>	1	0	3	2	1	0
English sole	<i>Pleuronectes vetulus</i>	0	0	0	0	1	0
longfin smelt	<i>Spirinchus thaleichthys</i>	36	5	215	220	132	45
northern anchovy	<i>Engraulis mordax</i>	1	30	28	12	44	80
Pacific herring	<i>Clupea pallasii</i>	1	10	0	0	3	11
Pacific staghorn sculpin	<i>Leptocottus armatus</i>	1	2	0	4	1	3
plainfin midshipman	<i>Porichthys notatus</i>	0	1	1	1	0	0
prickly sculpin	<i>Cottus asper</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
shimofuri goby*	<i>Tridentiger bifasciatus</i>	2	1	3	0	2	0
Shokihaze goby*	<i>Tridentiger barbatus</i>	0	0	0	0	2	1
splittail	<i>Pogonichthys macrolepidotus</i>	11	0	5	5	4	0
starry flounder	<i>Platichthys stellatus</i>	3	3	3	0	0	0
striped bass*	<i>Morone saxatilis</i>	35	33	26	33	44	26
threadfin shad*	<i>Dorosoma petenense</i>	0	0	1	0	4	8
white croaker	<i>Genyonemus lineatus</i>	2	6	0	0	1	1
white sturgeon	<i>Acipenser transmontanus</i>	3	0	0	1	0	0
yellowfin goby*	<i>Acanthogobius flavimanus</i>	2	1	1	3	13	3
* Introduced species							
Source: Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary and California Department of Fish and Game's San Francisco Bay Study (CDFG 2003).							

Earlier fish collections in the vicinity of the Shore terminal were done by Entrix (1991). Entrix collected fishes and benthic invertebrates by otter trawl on the south shore of Carquinez Strait between the Benicia-Martinez Bridge and the mouth of Peyton Slough in 1990. The most abundant fish species they collected was Pacific staghorn sculpin. They also collected plainfin midshipman (*Porichthys notatus*), yellowfin goby, starry flounder, striped bass and longfin smelt. In June 1988, Entrix conducted otter trawls in the same areas and, again Pacific staghorn sculpin was the most abundant fish species. Other fishes collected in 1988 included speckled sandab (*Citharichthys stigmaeus*), starry flounder, shiner surfperch, green sturgeon, yellowfin goby, prickly sculpin (*Cottus asper*), and brown rockfish (*Sebastes auriculatus*).

The 1990 and 1988 Entrix studies also collected fishes by beach seine on the mudflats at the mouth of Peyton Slough (Entrix 1991). Table 3.3-7 shows the fishes collected in these studies. Topsmelt (*Atherinops affinis*) and striped bass were the most abundant fishes collected in 1990. Pacific staghorn sculpin and topsmelt were the most abundant fishes collected on the mudflat in 1988.

Table 3.3-7
Relative Fish Abundance at Peyton Mudflat
Collected by 50 Foot Beach Seine

Species	1998	1999
Pacific staghorn sculpin	5	0
striped bass	2	4
Topsmelt	4	5
starry flounder	1	0.5
shiner surfperch	1	0
yellowfin goby	1	3
bay goby	2	0
northern anchovy	1	0
white catfish	1	0
Source: Entrix 1991.		

Previous studies also have collected fishes within the channels of Peyton Slough near Shore Terminals (Entrix 1991). Three fish species were caught: striped bass, yellowfin goby and chameleon goby (*Tridentiger trignocephalus*). All of these are introduced species. Chameleon gobies were the most abundant fish species collected.

Earlier fish surveys were done in Peyton Slough in 1986 and 1988 (in Entrix 1991). Peyton Slough was surveyed in 1988 as part of the Shell oil spill studies. Pacific staghorn sculpin was the most abundant fish species in the 1988 otter trawls. Bay gobies (*Lepidogobius lepidus*) also were collected. The 1986 fish surveys in Peyton Slough were dominated by Sacramento splittail and striped bass. Other fish species collected included staghorn sculpin, threespine stickleback (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*), inland silversides (*Menidia beryllina*), and yellowfin goby.

URS (2002) reported that two Chinook salmon smolts were collected in the McNabney Marsh area, which is south of Waterfront Road and connected to Peyton Slough by tide gates, during three years of sampling between 1998 and 2001. In addition, Chinook salmon and Sacramento splittail have been collected in tributaries of Pacheco Creek (Leidy 1999). These observations indicate that sensitive fish species enter sloughs in the vicinity of the Shore terminal.

The north shore of Suisun Bay contains Suisun Marsh with its extensive slough system. The fishes in the various sloughs of Suisun Marsh were studied by Meng, Moyle, and Herbold (1994). Their studies collected 42 species in the sloughs of Suisun Marsh. Fourteen species accounted for 98 percent of the total catch. The most abundant species included five native resident species: prickly sculpin, Sacramento sucker (*Catostomus occidentalis*), Sacramento splittail, threespine stickleback and Tule perch (*Hysterothorax traski*); five seasonal species: Delta smelt, longfin smelt, Pacific staghorn sculpin, starry flounder, and threadfin shad (*Dorosoma petense*); and four introduced species: chameleon goby, common carp (*Cyprinus carpio*), striped bass, and yellowfin goby.

1 Although not collected in any of the surveys reviewed here, Central valley steelhead
2 clearly pass through Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay on their migrations between the
3 ocean and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system and smolts would be expected at
4 times to use the sloughs on either side of Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay.

5 6 **Important Fish Species of the Project Area (see previous section for sensitive 7 species)**

8 9 Striped Bass (*Morone saxatilis*)

10
11 The striped bass was introduced in 1879 and was successful enough to support a
12 commercial fishery until 1935, when commercial fishing was banned. The striped bass
13 spawns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers at salinities of 0 to 0.5 ppt. At salinities
14 greater than 1 ppt, egg survival declines significantly (Jefferson Assoc. 1987). After
15 spawning, the adults move back downstream to the Bay and ocean where they remain
16 until the following breeding season. Juvenile striped bass migrate downstream to the
17 Delta and the Bay where they remain during their first year. Young fish rearing habitat
18 extends into San Pablo Bay during wet years (CALFED Bay-Delta Program 1998).

19
20 The striped bass population has declined significantly in recent years. Hydrological
21 changes in the Delta seem to be the primary cause of this decline (Herbold et al. 1991),
22 but there may be other factors, such as the accumulation of toxic contaminants and
23 reduction of the larval food supply. In 1996, some of the lowest abundances ever
24 recorded in regular surveys were reported (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).
25 These low catches were especially unusual because 1996 was a wet year. Other
26 theories for the decline in striped bass include young fish entrainment at water export
27 pumps in the Delta, greater migration of adult bass out to sea in El Nino storm years,
28 and reduced "carrying capacity" of the system. Population estimates for legal-sized fish
29 were about 1.8 million in the early 1970s and 0.8 million by the late 1990s. Striped bass
30 populations increased to about 1.3 million in 1998 (Stevens and Kohlhorst 2001). The
31 increased abundance in the late 1990s is unexplained, but may be due to factors
32 allowing greater survival of young fish.

33 34 American Shad (*Alosa sapidissima*)

35
36 American shad populations in San Francisco Bay rapidly increased following its
37 introduction in 1871. American shad spend most of their adult lives in the ocean, except
38 for a brief spawning run into fresh water. Most of the shad in the area around
39 San Francisco Bay spawn in the Sacramento River or its tributaries. Spawning
40 migrations begin in March and peak spawning occurs in late May or June. Most of the
41 young migrate downstream rapidly after hatching. By December, most are gone, but a
42 few remain as long as a year. Many adults die after spawning, but some return to the
43 ocean and spawn again in later years. American shad spawn least successfully in dry
44 years.

1 White Sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) and Green Sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*)

2
3 Two species of sturgeon inhabit the San Francisco estuary-Delta system, the white
4 sturgeon and the green sturgeon. The white sturgeon is much more abundant in
5 San Francisco estuary than the green sturgeon, partly because green sturgeon spend a
6 greater portion of their lives in the ocean. Recruitment of white sturgeon appears to be
7 greatest in years of high outflow.
8

9 The San Francisco Bay estuary supports the southernmost reproducing population of
10 green sturgeon which spawn in the Sacramento River (Moyle and Yoshiyama 1992).
11 The largest spawning population of green sturgeon in California is in the Klamath River
12 Basin. The green sturgeon has been designated as a California Species of Special
13 Concern.
14

15 Northern Anchovy (*Ergraulis mordax*)

16
17 The northern anchovy is the most abundant fish in San Francisco Bay. Northern
18 anchovy are seasonally present in San Francisco Bay. They tend to enter the Bay in
19 April of most years and migrate out to the ocean in the fall. In San Pablo Bay, anchovy
20 abundance peaks later and drops more rapidly than in Central Bay. Most of the
21 population spawns in the ocean, but spawning within the Bay has also been reported.
22 Larval anchovies begin to appear in the Bay early in the spawning season of February
23 through June. Northern anchovy show large fluctuations in numbers in response to
24 both marine and estuarine conditions, but there are no obvious trends in recent years.
25

26 Pacific Herring (*Clupea harengus*)

27
28 Pacific herring enter San Francisco Bay in late fall and winter to spawn and then return
29 to the ocean. Most of the spawning in San Francisco Bay occurs in intertidal and
30 shallow habitats of the central Bay and northern south Bay. Smaller young tend to be
31 widely distributed in shallower habitats in South, Central, and San Pablo Bays. As they
32 grow, they move to deeper waters closer to the Golden Gate. Most young Pacific
33 herring emigrate from the Bay between April and August. Since 1974, there has been a
34 trend toward increasing biomass of spawning herring. The spawning biomass of Pacific
35 herring was the third highest on record in 1996 and 1997 at 89,000 tons (San Francisco
36 Estuary Project 1997). The previous year produced the second-highest biomass on
37 record at 99,000 tons. However 1998 yielded the lowest year on record. The lowest
38 biomass estimates have occurred during or just after El Nino events (Watters et al.
39 2001). San Francisco Bay's population has not yet recovered from the effects of the
40 1997-1998 El Nino. Spawning biomass was estimated at 27,400 tons in 2000.
41

42 **Tidal Marshes**

43
44 Figure 3.3-3 shows tidal marshes in the project area. Three tidal marsh areas,
45 Southampton Bay, Benicia Marsh and Martinez Marsh, occur in Carquinez Strait west of
46 the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. Suisun Bay east of the bridge is ringed with tidal marshes.
47 The tidal marsh system of Suisun Bay historically was much more extensive, but most
48 of the tidal marshland was diked.

3.3-3 – Project Area Marshes

1 Tidal marshes in the project area are a mixture of northern coastal salt marsh and
2 coastal brackish marsh. Northern coastal salt marsh is dominated by salt-tolerant
3 herbaceous and perennial species. These plant assemblages typically are found along
4 the margin of the bay where they are exposed to periodic tidal inundation by salt water.
5 Species typical of the northern coastal salt marsh community include pickleweed
6 (*Salicornia virginica*), alkali heath (*Frankenia salina*), jaumea (*Jaumea carnosa*), alkali
7 bulrush (*Scirpus robustus*), and arrowgrass (*Triglochin maritime*).
8

9 Coastal brackish marsh communities are found at the interior edges of coastal bays and
10 estuaries and are influenced by both saltwater and freshwater inputs. Salinity in these
11 marshes may vary considerably during the year due to seasonal changes in freshwater
12 runoff. In the project area brackish marsh habitat typically occurs along channels at the
13 upper end of tidal marshes where freshwater runoff can be pronounced. Plant species
14 typical of this community include California bulrush (*Scirpus californicus*), American
15 bulrush (*Scirpus americanus*), and narrowleaf cattail (*Typha angustifolia*).
16

17 Point Reyes Bird Observatory surveyed the vegetation of several of the tidal marshes in
18 the project area as part of their studies on tidal marsh birds (Nur et al. 1997). Table 3.3-8
19 shows the percent plant cover of various species in these marshes. Pickleweed was
20 the dominant plant species in Southampton Bay Marsh in Carquinez Strait and in
21 portions of Goodyear Slough along the northwestern edge of Suisun Bay. In Bulls Head
22 Marsh (Peyton Slough), Point Edith and portions of Goodyear Slough, cattail was the
23 dominant species, indicating a stronger freshwater influence. At Rush Ranch in the
24 interior portions of Suisun Marsh, rushes (*Scirpus* spp.) are the dominant vegetation.
25

26 Plant communities adjacent to the Shore terminal Pier were surveyed briefly in 2002.
27 Most of the bayward portions of the site supported northern coastal salt marsh. The
28 dominant native species observed at the site included pickleweed, salt grass, and
29 spearscale (*Atriplex triangularis*). Alkali heath and marsh gum plant (*Grindelia stricta*
30 var. *angustifolia*) were also observed. Portions of the coastal salt marsh habitat were
31 infested with perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), an invasive, non-native weed
32 species. Higher ground areas scattered throughout the marsh support clumps of coyote
33 brush (*Baccharis pilularis*). Planted coyote brush and toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*)
34 shrubs form a boundary between parts of the salt marsh and upland disturbed areas.
35 Coastal brackish marsh occurs in deeper channels within the coastal salt marsh habitat
36 at the site. The most common species observed in the coastal brackish marsh habitat
37 were tule (*Scirpus acutus*), cattail (*Typha* sp.) and common reed (*Phragmites australis*).
38 Suisun marsh aster (*Aster lentus*), a California Native Plant Society 1B species, was
39 observed in brackish marsh habitat on the site. The marsh in the vicinity of the Shore
40 terminal also is considered to have high potential to support the federal endangered
41 Suisun thistle, the federal endangered and state rare soft bird's beak, the state rare
42 Mason's lilaeopsis, the Delta tule pea (California Native Plant Society 1B list), and Delta
43 mugwort (California Native Plant Society List 2) because of appropriate habitat on the
44 site and the known occurrence of these species throughout the general project area.

Table 3.3-8
Vegetative Characteristics (percent cover shown) of
Selected Marshes Along Suisun Bay, 1996

Common Name	Scientific Name	South-Hampton Bay Marsh	Bulls Head Marsh	Point Edith Marsh	Goodyear Slough A	Goodyear Slough B	Rush Ranch
Brass Buttons	<i>Cotula coronopifolia</i>	-	-	4.5	1.25	-	0.12
Common Cat-Tail	<i>Typha latifolia</i>	-	33.5	36.75	-	20.37	-
Common Reed	<i>Phragmites australis</i>	-	-	1.12	3.87	1.87	-
Common Pickleweed	<i>Salicornia virginica</i>	54.45	7.37	6.87	79.37	13.37	0.56
Common Tule	<i>Scirpus acutus</i> var. <i>occidentalis</i>	-	11.37	-	-	-	-
Coyote Bush	<i>Baccharis pilularis</i>	-	3.5	3.37	-	3	-
Fennel	<i>Foeniculum vulgare</i>	-	-	0.5	-	0.25	-
Gum-Plant	<i>Grindelia nana</i> var. <i>angulstifolia</i> (<i>humilis</i>)	5.87	-	1.0	0.12	3.37	-
Rushes	<i>Juncus</i> spp.	4.45	4.62	0.62	1	4.37	37.32
Meadow Foxtail	<i>Alopecurus</i> sp.	-	-	-	2.12	0.25	-
Mustard	<i>Brassica</i> spp.	-	0.12	-	-	-	-
Ox Tongue	<i>Picris echioides</i>	-	-	-	-	1.37	-
Peppergrass	<i>Lepidium hydrophilium</i>	10.75	0.37	12.75	0.05	4.75	15.01
Poison Hemlock	<i>Conium maculatum</i>	-	-	-	-	0.25	-
Poison Oak	<i>Toxicodendron diversilobum</i>	-	0.25	-	-	-	-
Ragwort	<i>Senecio hydrophilus</i>	0.75	-	-	-	-	-
Saltgrass	<i>Distichlis spicata</i>	12.45	3.75	17.0	9.87	8.37	16.76
Bulrush	<i>Scirpus microcarpus</i>	3.05	13.5	6.25	-	7.25	13.05
Seaside Arrow-Grass	<i>Triglochin maritima</i>	1.62	0.12	-	-	0.5	0.59
Silverweed	<i>Potentilla anserina</i>	2.25	-	-	-	-	9.26
Suisun Thistle	<i>Cirsium fontinale</i> var. <i>hydrophilium</i>	-	-	-	-	-	0.11
White Sweetclover	<i>Melilotus alba</i>	-	-	0.12	-	-	-
Water Parsley	<i>Oenanthe sarmentosa</i>	-	2	-	-	-	0.94
Wild Buckwheat	<i>Rumex</i> sp.	2.3	-	-	1.45	1.87	0.1
Wild Radish	<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	-	-	-	-	28.75	-
Unknown Grass		1.75	-	-	-	-	-
Unknown Herb		0.65	0.25	1.5	-	-	-
Unknown Thistle		0.05	-	0.25	-	-	-
Source: Nur et al 1997							

Avifauna

The open water, mudflats, sloughs, and marshes of the project area provide a rich habitat for birds associated with tidal waters. Two species of seabird breed in the project area: western gull and California least tern (Carter et al. 1992). Western gulls breed at various locations throughout Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay. The state and federal endangered California least tern has a small colony at Pittsburg at the eastern edge of the project area. Double-crested cormorants, a California Species of Special Concern, breed outside the project area in San Francisco Bay but may forage in the waters of Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay. The state and federal endangered California brown pelican does not nest in San Francisco Bay but is present seasonally especially during summer months and forages in project area waters (Corps, EPA, BCDC, RWQCB and SWRCB 1998).

Like all of the waters of San Francisco Bay, the project area provides important habitat for wintering waterfowl. Scaup and canvasbacks (*Aythya valisineria*) are the most abundant waterfowl species in Suisun Bay (Chambers Group 1994). Particularly high densities of canvasbacks have been recorded in the Grizzly Bay portion of Suisun Bay (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

Large numbers of wintering shorebirds forage and rest in intertidal mudflat habitat in the project area. However, less than 1 percent of the wintering shorebird population in San Francisco Bay occurs within the project areas (Chambers Group 1994). Intertidal mudflat is most extensive along the margins of Grizzly Bay. Suisun Shoal in the center of western Suisun Bay just northeast of the Shore terminal pier is an important location for shorebird feeding and loafing (USCG and OSPR 2000). Suisun Shoal is also used by waterfowl for feeding and resting. Common shorebirds in the project area include dunlin (*Calidris alpina*), long billed curlew, American avocet (*Recurvirostra americana*), western and least sandpiper (*Calidris mauri* and *C. minutilla*), killdeer (*Charadrius vociferous*), long-billed dowitcher (*Limnodromus scolopaceus*), and marbled godwit (*Limosa fedoa*) (Corps, EPA, BCDC, RWQCB and SWRCB 1998)

Wading birds, including great blue herons (*Ardea herodias*), great egrets (*Casmerodius albus*), snowy egrets (*Egretta thula*), and black-crowned night herons (*Nycticorax nycticorax*), are resident in the project area and forage along the margins of project area sloughs. Great blue herons are relatively common in low-salinity salt ponds. Their distribution is not completely known, but includes sites in most tidal marshes where trees or brush occur for nesting. Great egrets and snowy egrets are known to nest in a number of marshes in the project area particularly in the Suisun Marsh complex (Chambers Group 1994). The distribution of black-crowned night heron nesting sites is not well known, but they are believed to nest in a number of areas in the north bay.

Project area marshes support a number of sensitive marsh birds including black rail, California clapper rail, saltmarsh common yellowthroat and Suisun song sparrow. Recent surveys of black rails have produced an overall mean density estimate of 3.44 birds per hectare in the project area (Spautz and Nur 2002). These studies indicate that black rails prefer marshes that are close to water (bay or river), large, away

1 from urban areas and saline to brackish with a high proportion of pickleweed, tules and
2 cattails. Based on the survey results and the amount of appropriate habitat, it is
3 projected that approximately 12,000 black rails occur in Suisun Bay and Carquinez
4 Strait (Spautz and Nur 2002). Within the project area, black rails are especially
5 abundant at Southamptton Bay in Carquinez Strait (mean density of 11.87 birds per
6 hectare) and Cutoff Slough/Rush Ranch in the interior of Suisun Marsh (mean density of
7 10.11 per hectare). Black rails occur in Peyton Slough in the immediate vicinity of the
8 Shore terminal but their density there is relatively low (mean density of 2.74 rails per
9 hectare).

10
11 Suitable habitat for California clapper rail occurs in project area marshes and there are
12 a number of records of this species within the project area, especially in the Point Edith
13 Marsh (CDFG 2002). California clapper rails have been observed recently at Pacheco
14 Creek (URS 2002b).

15
16 Suisun song sparrows occur in marshes throughout the project area (Nur et al. 1997).
17 The population of this endemic subspecies is estimated at 44,100. The density of
18 Suisun song sparrows in Peyton Slough near the Shore terminal is approximately
19 8.71 sparrows per hectare (Nur et al. 1997). Saltmarsh common yellowthroats also
20 occur in project area marshes including Peyton Slough (Nur et al. 1997).

21 22 **Marine Mammals**

23
24 No major pinniped haul out areas occur in the project area. Workers at Shore
25 Terminals report observing substantial numbers of California sea lions in the vicinity of
26 the Shore terminal pier.

27 28 29 **3.3.3 Impacts Analysis and Mitigation Measures**

30 31 **Impact Significance Criteria**

32
33 An impact to biological resources was considered significant if:

- 34
- 35 ➤ Any part of the population of a threatened, endangered, or candidate species is
36 directly affected or if its habitat is lost or disturbed. Any loss of designated or
37 proposed critical habitat for a listed species would be a significant adverse impact.
 - 38
 - 39 ➤ If a net loss occurs in the functional habitat value of a sensitive biological habitat,
40 including salt, freshwater, or brackish marsh; major marine mammal haul out or
41 breeding area; eelgrass, major seabird rookery; or Area of Special Biological
42 Significance.
 - 43
 - 44 ➤ If the movement or migration of fish or wildlife is substantially impeded. Substantial
45 impedance would include preventing or severely restricting passage over an area of
46 at least several hundred feet for a period of a week or more.
 - 47

- If a substantial loss occurs in the population or habitat of any native fish, wildlife, or vegetation, or if there is an overall loss of biological diversity. Substantial is defined as any change that could be detected over natural variability.

3.3.3.1 Shore Marine Terminal Routine Operations and Potential for Accident Conditions

Impact BIO-1: Noise Disturbance on Fishes and Birds from Vessel Traffic Movements

Ship traffic associated with Shore terminal operations represents an incremental amount compared to the background noise of ship traffic in San Francisco Bay and along outer coast tanker routes, thus disturbance to fishes from routine operations at the terminal are less than significant impacts (Class III). Birds local to the Shore terminal, including Peyton Slough, have adapted to vessel traffic, and impacts are less than significant (Class III).

Fishes could be disturbed by the noise of vessels visiting the Shore marine terminal. Suzuki et al. (1980) have documented studies showing that ship noise can affect fish behavior. These investigators believed that the sounds produced by large or high-speed vessels could frighten fish schools or cause them to change their migration routes. Studies also have suggested that the noises produced by fishing vessels and by underwater construction causes avoidance behavior in fishes (Myrberg 1990). Other studies have shown only slight avoidance behavior by fishes in response to ship noise (Freon et al. 1990; Neproshin 1978). Scientific SCUBA divers on Naples Reef in Santa Barbara have noticed that fishes scatter briefly as oil boats pass over the reef (personal communication, Ebeling 1985). Because ship noise represents a temporary disturbance and the ship traffic associated with operations at the Shore marine terminal represents an incremental amount compared to the background noise of ship traffic in San Francisco Bay and along outer coast tanker routes, noise and disturbance to fishes from routine operations at the terminal are expected to have adverse but less than significant impacts (Class III).

Similarly, vessel noise and activity could disturb birds in the vicinity of the Shore marine terminal or along tanker routes. Western gulls and western grebes were observed during a berthing operation at the Shore marine terminal in November 2002 and displayed no unusual behavior in response to the ship. Vessel traffic is commonplace throughout San Francisco Bay and water-associated birds that use the bay appear to have adapted to it. Vessels associated with the Shore marine terminal represent a small fraction of the total vessel traffic in San Francisco Bay and along outer coast tanker routes. The impacts of disturbance by vessels visiting Shore Terminals on birds is considered to be adverse but less than significant (Class III).

The Shore terminal pier crosses a vegetated marsh. All activities associated with Shore Terminals operations are on the pier itself. Marine terminal activities involve no direct disturbance of marsh habitat. The noise of operations on the Shore terminal pier

1 potentially could disturb birds in the marsh. Sensitive bird species that occur in Peyton
2 Slough near the terminal includes the State threatened California black rail and the
3 Suisun song sparrow, a California Species of Special Concern. Because sensitive bird
4 species breed in Peyton Marsh in the vicinity of Shore Terminals, it is likely that they
5 wildlife using the marsh is adapted to the noise and activity on the pier. Impacts of
6 disturbance from Shore Terminals operations on birds and wildlife in the adjacent marsh
7 are considered adverse but less than significant (Class III).

8
9 BIO-1: No mitigation is required.

10 11 **Impact BIO-2: Sediment Disturbance to Benthic Habitat from Vessel Maneuvers**

12
13 **The area near the Shore Terminals berth where propeller wash and bow thrusters**
14 **may disturb sediments is very small compared to the amount of benthic habitat in**
15 **the project area, and impacts of tanker sediment turbulence on benthic**
16 **communities are adverse but less than significant (Class III).**

17
18 When large ships, such as oil tankers, enter shallow water, the turbulence created by
19 their hull and propellers can disturb the sediment in their path. Organisms living in or on
20 the sediment could be displaced by the turbulence. The benthic environment of the ship
21 channels is an unstable one of shifting sand (Entrix 1987). The benthic community that
22 lives in this environment has very low diversity and is comprised of organisms adapted
23 to this unstable environment. SAIC noted in a 1996 survey that stations within
24 navigation channels near the Point Molate fuel pier had low infaunal abundance (Corps
25 and Contra Costa County 1997). They attributed the scarcity of infauna to the effects of
26 propeller wash. Because the navigation channels used by the tankers visiting the Shore
27 marine terminal are the same as those used by a great number of ships visiting various
28 ports in the Bay, the sparse infauna that characterizes these channels would be the
29 same without the impact of the tankers traveling to and from the Shore terminal. The
30 area in the vicinity of the Shore Terminals berth where propeller wash and bow thrusters
31 may disturb sediments is very small compared to the amount of benthic habitat in the
32 project area. Impacts of tanker turbulence on benthic communities are expected to be
33 adverse but less than significant (Class III). Shore Terminals tankers would contribute
34 to cumulative effects.

35
36 BIO-2: No mitigation is required.

37 38 **Impact BIO-3: Maintenance Dredging**

39
40 **Loss of juvenile Dungeness crabs and young Chinook salmon would be a**
41 **significant, adverse impact because dredging at the time when juveniles are**
42 **moving through the area could disrupt the migration patterns of these species**
43 **(Class II). Because of the low volume of material dredged, less than significant**
44 **impacts (Class III) occur to plankton, other benthos, other fishes, and birds.**

45
46 In order to maintain adequate depth for tankers, the berth on the north side of the Shore
47 terminal pier must be dredged about every three years. Approximately 6,000 cubic
48 yards (cy) of material were excavated in 2004. In the past this material has been

disposed of at the Corps' Dredged Material Management Office (DMMO) designated disposal site SF-9 (Carquinez Strait). For this analysis it is assumed that Shore Terminals would continue to dispose of dredged wharf material to this site and/or other DMMO-approved sites, including upland reuse areas.

Plankton

Dredging can affect plankton in the vicinity of the dredging and disposal operations from turbidity generated by resuspension of sediments and from the resuspension of any pollutants associated with those sediments. Turbidity can have a number of adverse effects on planktonic organisms. Turbidity can affect plankton populations by lowering the light available for phytoplankton photosynthesis and by clogging the filter-feeding mechanisms and respiratory organs of zooplankton. The sediment at the Shore marine terminal consists primarily of sand sized particles. Therefore dredging of sediments at Shore Terminals and disposal of the material at the Carquinez Strait disposal site would not be expected to generate extensive turbidity plumes.

Sediments at the Shore marine terminal have been shown to have relatively low toxicity (ABC 2000). Therefore, minimal impacts to planktonic organisms are expected from the limited duration that the sediments would be in the water column. Previous studies of dredging operations have determined that water column effects of dredging are rarely a pathway of concern (Corps, EPA, BCDC, SF-RWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). Because of the low toxicity, infrequent dredging, low volume of material, and minimal turbidity, the impacts of maintenance dredging at the marine terminal on plankton would be adverse but less than significant (Class III).

Benthic Organisms

Maintenance dredging at the Shore marine terminal would displace the organisms living within the dredged sediments. Benthic organisms in sediments adjacent to the dredge area may be buried by suspended sediments or may be subjected to sublethal effects of turbidity such as interference with feeding and breathing mechanisms. A study of the effects of dredging on benthic organisms at a dredging site near Mare Island in northeast San Pablo Bay showed that the density of benthic organisms was greatly reduced in the area that was dredged annually compared to an undredged area (DiSalvo 1977). Dredging at the Shore marine terminal may decrease the density and diversity of benthic organisms in the dredged areas compared to what the infaunal community would be if the area were not dredged. However, the dominant species are expected to be similar. Infaunal assemblages in the project area are dominated by opportunistic introduced species including the Asian clam and the amphipod *Ampelisca abdita* (Thompson et al. 2000). Therefore, following dredging, the benthic community likely would rapidly return to an assemblage typical of the pre-dredging conditions. However, disturbance by dredging would tend to favor opportunistic introduced species at the expense of native species. Because the amount of bottom affected by dredging at Shore Terminals is a small percentage of the soft bottom area of Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay, the impacts of maintenance dredging on infaunal organisms would be adverse but less than significant (Class III).

1 Epifaunal benthic species of concern in the vicinity of the Shore marine terminal include
2 grass shrimp and Dungeness crabs. Maintenance dredging would disturb individuals of
3 these species within the dredging area. Some individuals may be collected by the
4 dredge. Others would leave the area. Because dredging occurs in a limited area and
5 only every three years, the impacts on grass shrimp would be adverse but less than
6 significant (Class III). However, juvenile Dungeness crab can be common in the project
7 area especially in dry years, and could easily be entrained by the dredge (Corps, EPA,
8 BCDC, SF-RWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). Loss of juvenile Dungeness crabs would be a
9 significant, adverse impact because dredging at the time when juveniles are moving
10 through the area could disrupt the migration patterns of the species (Class II). The
11 impact could be mitigated to less than significant by avoiding dredging during September
12 when first year Dungeness crabs are most abundant in Suisun Bay (Baxter et al. 1999).

13
14 Benthic organisms in the disposal area would be buried by the dredge spoils.
15 Organisms in adjacent areas would be subjected to turbidity. At the Alcatraz site,
16 impacts to benthic communities have been identified not only within the disposal area,
17 where large mounds have formed, but also at a distance of 2,000 feet from the site
18 (Segar 1988; Corps, EPA, BCDC, SF-RWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). Localized impacts
19 to benthic organisms have been identified at other dredged material disposal sites off
20 the coast of California (Chambers Group 2001). Because the Carquinez Strait disposal
21 site is characterized by opportunistic benthic species, the disturbance of dredged
22 material disposal would probably have less of an effect at this site than at sites in less
23 disturbed locations (Corps, EPA, BCDC, RWQCB, and SWRCB 1998). Furthermore,
24 the average of 6,000 cubic yards that may be discharged every three years at this site
25 from Shore Terminals' maintenance dredging represents less than .05 percent of the
26 amount of dredged material that may be discharged at this site when considered on an
27 annual basis. Impacts of disposal of dredged material on benthic organisms would be
28 adverse but less than significant (Class III).

29 30 Fishes

31
32 Fishes can be harmed or disturbed by turbidity from maintenance dredging at the Shore
33 terminal and discharge of dredged material at the Carquinez Strait disposal site. Fishes
34 rarely become entrained by the dredge itself but may be exposed to high levels of
35 suspended sediments (Herbold et al. 1992). Fishes exposed to suspended sediments
36 in the laboratory have been shown to suffer mortality as well as sublethal signs of stress
37 (Soule and Oguri 1976; O'Conner et al. 1977; Neuman et al. 1982). Most fishes,
38 however, will simply avoid the dredge and disposal areas during these operations.
39 Dredged material disposal at the Alcatraz disposal site in Central Bay does not appear
40 to cause mortality in fishes but has been observed to affect the movement of fish
41 schools (Monroe and Kelly 1992). In a study of fish behavior at the Alcatraz disposal
42 site, northern anchovy, white croaker, and shiner perch were observed to move away
43 from the site immediately following a disposal event but returned within 1 to 2 hours.
44 Because dredging at the Shore marine terminal would only occur once every three
45 years and because the amount of material dredged would be extremely small, the
46 impacts of maintenance dredging at the terminal and disposal of dredged sediments on
47 most species of fish are expected to be adverse but less than significant (Class III).

Chinook salmon may be disturbed during maintenance dredging, primarily due to turbidity, although there is some potential that juvenile salmon could be entrained by the dredge. Turbidity during dredging is expected to occur only in the immediate vicinity of the dredging activity. However, because young Chinook salmon are known to occur in the vicinity of the terminal and because the winter and spring runs are so reduced, the impacts of maintenance dredging would be potentially significant (Class II). Impacts could be reduced to less than significant by conducting dredging in July and August, when winter and spring run smolt activity is lowest.

Birds

Turbidity plumes during maintenance dredging and dredged material disposal can affect piscivorous birds by making it difficult for them to see prey. Sensitive bird species that may forage on fishes in the project area include the state and federal endangered California least tern, the state and federal endangered brown pelican, and the double-crested cormorant, a California Species of Special Concern. Because maintenance dredging at Shore terminal is so infrequent, because the volume is so small, and because the sand-sized particles are expected to generate minimal turbidity plumes, impacts of maintenance dredging on birds would be adverse but less than significant (Class III).

Mitigation Measures for BIO-3:

BIO-3a: In order to reduce the entrainment of juvenile Dungeness crab, Shore Terminals shall schedule dredging to avoid the month of September when juvenile Dungeness crabs are most abundant in the project area.

BIO-3b: Although chances of entrainment of salmon is relatively low, to protect the salmon, Shore Terminals shall schedule dredging in July and August when winter and spring run Chinook salmon smolt activity is lowest.

Rationale for Mitigation: Avoidance of the times of the year when Dungeness crab and Chinook salmon smolt are present would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Impact BIO-4: Introduction of Non-Indigenous Species

Invasive organisms/introduction of non-indigenous species in segregated ballast water released in the Bay could have significant (Class I) impacts to plankton, benthos, fishes, and birds.

Tankers servicing the Shore marine terminal do not discharge unsegregated ballast water to the Bay. However, they may discharge segregated ballast water. Segregated ballast water is expected to be relatively free of chemical pollutants (see Section 3.2.3.1), but the ballast water may harbor exotic species that upon release may cause problems in the estuary's ecosystem. Exotic organisms have had a devastating effect on the estuary's planktonic ecosystem (Carlton 1979; Cohen 1998). For example, the Asian clam *Potamocorbula amurensis*, thought to have been introduced in ballast water, has

1 depleted phytoplankton populations in Suisun Bay by its intensive feeding
2 (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997). In addition to reducing the food base by feeding
3 on phytoplankton, voracious feeding by the Asian clam also has directly reduced some
4 zooplankton populations (Lehman 1998). Furthermore, introduced zooplankton species
5 such as *Sinocalanus doerri* and *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi* appear to have outcompeted
6 native species in Suisun Bay and the western Delta (Herbold et al. 1991). If a foreign
7 species were introduced that could flourish in the Bay, impacts to the existing planktonic
8 communities could be significant (Class I).

9
10 Introduction of exotic species, including the Asian clam introduced in 1986, has had a
11 devastating effect on the benthic community of the estuary. Almost all of the dominant
12 benthic invertebrate species in San Francisco estuary are introduced and extremely
13 high densities of the Asian clam have been documented in Suisun Bay. As discussed in
14 Section 3.3.2, the rate of invasions is increasing. The recently introduced green crab,
15 for example, could affect benthic communities by preying on bivalves and outcompeting
16 Dungeness crabs. Invasive organisms in ballast water could have a significant impact
17 to the benthic community (Class I).

18
19 In addition to the introduction of invasive non-native species in ballast water, exotic
20 fouling organisms can be introduced to San Francisco Bay by fouling on ship's hulls.
21 Many species are thought to have been introduced to San Francisco Bay via ships' hulls
22 (Carlton 2001). The phasing out of tributyltin (TBT) based paints to control ship fouling
23 may increase the introduction of fouling species transported on vessel hulls.
24 Introduction of non-indigenous species via hull fouling on ships servicing the Shore
25 marine terminal also could have a significant adverse impact (Class I).

26
27 The introduction of exotic species to San Francisco Bay via ship traffic has not only
28 devastated the San Francisco Bay ecosystem, it has resulted in the spread of exotic
29 species to other areas of the west coast (Wasson et al. 2001). For example,
30 San Francisco Bay is suspected of being an important source of introduction of exotic
31 species to Elkhorn Slough (Wasson et al. 2001). The Australian reef-forming tubeworm
32 (*Ficopomatus enigmaticus*), the European green crab, and the western Pacific tellin
33 snail (*Philine auriformis*) all invaded San Francisco Bay, probably via international ship
34 traffic, before spreading along the California coast.

35
36 The introduction of non-indigenous species in ballast water discharges or by hull fouling
37 could have a number of adverse effects on fish populations in San Francisco Bay.
38 The eggs, larvae, or adults of non-native fishes may be present in ballast water
39 discharges. Non-native species compete with native fishes. In addition, non-
40 indigenous aquatic species such as the Asian clam tend to destabilize food webs.
41 Asian clams feed voraciously at multiple levels in the food chain, ultimately reducing the
42 food available for fishes (Cohen and Carlton 1995). Furthermore, because of the ability
43 of Asian clams to filter large volumes of water, this species tends to concentrate
44 pollutants such as selenium and organotins in its tissues (Pierera et al. 1999). Fishes
45 that feed on the Asian clam have the potential to ingest large quantities of toxins.
46 Finally, ballast water may introduce harmful algae. Harmful algal blooms have caused

1 fish kills in a number of places (Committee on Environment and Natural Resources
2 2000). Introduction of non-indigenous species has the potential to have a significant
3 adverse impact on fishes (Class I).

4
5 The introduction of non-indigenous species by ballast water discharges or hull fouling
6 could have adverse effects on bird populations in San Francisco Bay. Some waterfowl,
7 especially diving ducks, consume large numbers of Asian clams. Because they filter
8 large amounts of water, Asian clams may have high concentrations of contaminants in
9 their tissues (Pereira et al. 1999). Birds that feed on this species thus may ingest large
10 quantities of such harmful substances as selenium. In addition, toxic algae may be
11 introduced in ballast water discharges. For example, more than 100 cormorants and
12 California brown pelicans died in Monterey Bay in 1991 from domoic acid poisoning
13 produced by the diatom *Pseudo-nitzschia* (Committee on Environment and Natural
14 Resources 2000). The introduction of non-indigenous species from operations at the
15 Shore marine terminal has the potential to have a significant adverse impact on water-
16 associated birds in San Francisco Bay (Class I).

17 18 Mitigation Measures for BIO-4:

19
20 **BIO-4:** Mitigation Measure WQ-2 for vessel compliance with the California Marine
21 Invasive Species Control Act and related CSLC requirements shall apply.

22
23 Rationale for Mitigation: As per WQ-2, Shore has no facilities to treat segregated
24 ballast water and it may not be economically feasible to construct a system for treating
25 ballast water to remove exotic species. Furthermore, effective systems for the
26 treatment of ballast water to remove all associated organisms have not yet been
27 developed.

28
29 Residual Impacts: Until a feasible system to kill all organisms in ballast water is
30 developed, the discharge of ballast water to San Francisco Bay will remain a significant
31 adverse (Class I) impact.

32 33 **Impact BIO-5: Contaminants Associated with Routine Operations at the Shore** 34 **Marine Terminal**

35
36 **Contaminant inputs into the water from Shore terminal operations are low when**
37 **compared to other pollutant sources in the Bay. The impacts on plankton,**
38 **benthos, fishes, and birds are considered adverse, but less than significant**
39 **(Class III) impacts.**

40
41 As discussed in Section 3.2.3.1, routine inputs of contaminants from the Shore marine
42 terminal are low compared to other sources of pollutants in San Francisco Bay.
43 Because the volume of these inputs is extremely low relative to receiving water, and
44 because water movement in the vicinity of the marine terminal is good, rapid mixing is
45 expected to occur. Thus, the input of contaminant from routine operations at the Shore
46 terminal would not expose planktonic organisms to a high enough concentration of a
47 toxicant for a long enough period of time to have any measurable effect on a plankton

1 population. Therefore, the impact of routine inputs of pollutants from the Shore marine
2 terminal on plankton populations is expected to be adverse but less than significant
3 (Class III).

4
5 Chronic inputs of toxins from the Shore marine terminal could contribute to the pollutant
6 body burden of benthic organisms in the vicinity of the terminal. Of all the aquatic
7 communities, the benthic community at the terminal would be most susceptible to
8 impacts from the chronic input of pollutants associated with routine operations, because
9 many benthic organisms have low mobility and live in the sediments where pollutants
10 accumulate. As discussed in Section 3.2.3.1, the chronic release of contaminants
11 associated with routine operations at the terminal is low. Analysis of sediments at the
12 Shore marine terminal has found that several metals (arsenic, chromium, copper, nickel,
13 zinc) occur at concentrations high enough to have some effects on sensitive benthic
14 organisms (NOAA ER-L level). Although the Shore Terminals' contaminant inputs may
15 be affecting the benthic invertebrate communities in the immediate vicinity of the Shore
16 terminal pier, the area of impact would be localized to the immediate vicinity of the
17 terminal. The impacts to benthic organisms of chronic contaminant releases associated
18 with routine operations at the terminal would be adverse but less than significant
19 (Class III).

20
21 Input of pollutants from routine operations at the Shore marine terminal could add to the
22 pollutant body burden of fishes in the San Francisco Bay estuary. For example,
23 Whipple et al. (1987) have found that striped bass in the San Francisco Bay-Delta
24 system contained relatively high levels of pollutants, especially metals and
25 petrochemicals. Some of these pollutants showed strong correlation with poor health
26 and condition, parasite burdens, and impaired reproduction. Studies of contaminant
27 levels in fishes in San Francisco Bay showed that fishes collected in 1994 and 1997 had
28 elevated levels of contaminants, including mercury, PCBs, dieldren, DDT, and
29 chlordane (Davis et al. 1999). None of these chemicals would be expected to be
30 associated with Shore marine terminal operations. Furthermore, as discussed in
31 Section 3.2.3.1 inputs associated with routine operations at the terminal are low and
32 represent a small percentage of pollutant inputs in San Francisco Bay. Therefore,
33 chronic contamination to fishes from routine operations at the terminal are considered
34 adverse but less than significant impacts (Class III). Chemical inputs from operations at
35 the marine terminal will, however, contribute to significant cumulative impacts of
36 pollutant levels in San Francisco Bay.

37
38 Contaminants in the San Francisco Bay estuary both reduce the abundance of food for
39 birds and directly affect the health of populations. Diving ducks that consume mussels
40 and clams in these waters, especially scaup, scoters, and canvasback, are known to
41 have elevated levels of selenium, silver, copper, mercury, zinc, and cadmium. Levels of
42 selenium and mercury exceed that known to reduce or impair reproduction (Chambers
43 Group 1994). Caspian and Forster's terns, black-crowned night-herons, and snowy
44 egrets have been found to have organochlorines and mercury at levels associated with
45 impaired reproduction and thinning of egg shells (Ohlendorf et al. 1988). Double-
46 crested cormorant eggs collected from the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and the
47 San Mateo Bridge had a much higher concentration of PCBs than double-crested
48 cormorant eggs collected from Humboldt Bay (San Francisco Estuary Project 1997).

1 These high PCB levels were associated with various indicators of potentially adverse
2 physiological effects in the eggs. Nevertheless, populations of double-crested
3 cormorants in San Francisco Bay have continued to increase in recent years.

4
5 Discharges and small chronic leaks and spills associated with the marine terminal would
6 be below levels that would have direct impacts on birds. Effects such as soiling of
7 feathers from minor petroleum leaks and spills would be adverse but less than
8 significant (Class III). Of the contaminants that have been of the greatest concern for
9 birds in San Francisco Bay (selenium, mercury, DDTs, and PCBs) none are associated
10 with operations at the Shore marine terminal; suggesting that the terminal is not
11 contributing significantly to the body burden of these contaminants in San Francisco
12 Bay waterbirds. Pollutants related to routine operations at Shore Terminals are judged
13 to have an adverse but less than significant effect on birds (Class III).

14
15 BIO-5: No mitigation is required.

16 17 **Impact BIO-6: Oil Spills at Shore Marine Terminal**

18
19 **The impacts of a spill on the biota at or near the Shore terminal have the potential**
20 **to spread through Carquinez Strait and into Suisun and San Pablo Bays.**
21 **Vulnerable biota are plankton, benthos, eelgrass, fishes, marshes, birds, and**
22 **mammals. Per Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents section, small spills at the**
23 **terminal (less than 50 bbls) should be able to be contained (Class II impacts).**
24 **However, spills larger than 50 bbls may not be able to be contained and Shore**
25 **Terminals may not have adequate boom to protect all the sensitive areas at the**
26 **most risk that could be oiled within 3 hours of a spill from the terminal. Impacts**
27 **from large spills are considered to be significant adverse (Class I) impacts.**

28
29 This analysis of the impacts to biological resources of an oil spill at the Shore marine
30 terminal considers the sensitivity of each component of the biota to oil and the
31 vulnerability of its populations in the project area to a spill. Sensitivity considers how
32 sensitive the organisms are to oil while vulnerability considers how much of a population
33 could be affected by a spill. This assessment of oil spill impacts relied on documented
34 biological damages to resources from historic spill events as well as computer modeling
35 to determine the vulnerability of the biological resources within the Bay. Impacts to
36 biological resources from historic spills were based on the literature review in the EIR
37 for Consideration of a New Lease for the Operation of a Crude Oil and Petroleum
38 Product Marine Terminal at Unocal's San Francisco Refinery at Oleum (Chambers
39 Group 1994). The range of documented impacts from historic spills on various
40 biological resources is briefly summarized here. The Unocal EIR contains a more
41 detailed discussion of the scientific literature on the observed effects of spills.

42
43 This analysis considers the likely impacts to biological resources should a spill occur.
44 The probability of a spill is discussed in Section 3.1.3.1. The probability of a major spill
45 at the terminal is extremely low.

46
47 Documented biological damage from an oil spill has ranged from little apparent damage
48 in the Apex Galveston Bay spill (Greene 1991) to widespread and long-term damage,

1 such as the 1969 West Falmouth spill (Sanders 1977). Some of the factors influencing
2 the extent of damage caused by a spill are the dosage of oil, type of oil, local weather
3 conditions, location of the spill, time of year, methods used for cleanup, and the affected
4 area's previous exposure to oil. Other levels of concern are the possibility of food chain
5 contamination by petroleum products and the impact of an oil spill on the structure of
6 biological communities as a whole.

8 Oil spilled into marine waters gradually changes in chemical and physical makeup as it
9 is dissipated by evaporation, dissolution and mixing, or dilution in the water column.
10 Various fractions respond differently to these processes, and the weathered residue
11 behaves differently from the material originally spilled. Toxicity usually tends to
12 decrease as oil weathers.

14 Laboratory tests have demonstrated the toxicity of petroleum hydrocarbons for many
15 organisms. Soluble aromatic compounds in crude oil are generally toxic to marine
16 organisms at concentrations of 0.1 to 100 ppm. Planktonic larval stages are usually the
17 most sensitive. Very low levels of petroleum, below 0.01 mg/L, can affect such delicate
18 organisms as fish larvae (NRC 1985).

20 Biological impacts of oil spills include lethal and sublethal effects and indirect effects
21 resulting from either habitat alteration and/or destruction or contamination of a
22 population's food supply. Directly lethal effects may be chemical (such as poisoning by
23 contact or ingestion) or physical (such as coating or smothering with oil). A second
24 level of interaction is sublethal effects. Sublethal effects are those which do not kill an
25 individual but which render it less able to compete with individuals of the same and
26 other species.

28 To evaluate the effects of a spill at the terminal, three sets of oil spill analysis from
29 models were used. The results of all these models including figures are presented in
30 detail in Appendix B. The first set of oil spill trajectory analyses is Oil Spill Scenarios
31 No. 5 and No. 6 from the Unocal EIR (see Appendix B-1 of this EIR; Figures for
32 Scenarios No. 5 and No. 6 are on pages 6 and 7 of Appendix B-1). Both of these
33 scenarios modeled a 1,000 barrel spill in the tanker lane at the east end of Carquinez
34 Strait about 1 mile east of the Shore Terminals pier. Scenario No. 5 modeled a spill in
35 February during a flood tide. This spill showed that all oil beached within 27 hours.
36 Within the first 3 hours, winds and currents carried oil out of the Strait and into Suisun
37 Bay. Over the next 24 hours, oil spread extensively to contact intertidal mudflats in
38 Grizzly Bay, and around Roe, Ryer and Simmons Islands. Shoreline contact occurred
39 predominantly along eastern Grizzly Bay and the south side of Simmons and Dutton
40 Islands. Scenario No. 6 modeled a spill that occurred during July winds and a flood
41 tide. In this Scenario all oil beached after 12 hours. Most oil from this scenario spill
42 beached within a few hours of release along the south shore of Suisun Bay from about
43 Pacheco Creek to Middle Point.

45 The second set of oil spill analysis is from Shore Terminals Oil Spill Response Plan
46 (Bluewater Consultants 2001). These analyses modeled a 5,380 barrel spill from the
47 terminal under both summer and winter conditions. Under summer conditions, within

1 3 days the oil spread as far east as Chipps Island and as far west as the eastern end of
2 San Pablo Bay. Under winter conditions during the 3 days the oil spread from Chipps
3 Island on the east to the southeastern portion of San Pablo Bay on the west.

4
5 The third set of models was trajectory analyses performed for Clean Bay (in Wickland
6 Oil Martinez 1998). These models tracked 4,000 and 10,000 barrel spills from the south
7 side of Carquinez Strait near the Benicia Martinez Bridge. During the three days
8 modeled, the 4,000 barrel spill spread to approximately Pinole Point in San Pablo Bay
9 on the west to the southern boundary of Grizzly Bay. The 10,000 barrel spill spread
10 approximately 0.5 miles further into San Pablo and Grizzly Bays.

11
12 Finally, the effects of a real spill, the 1988 Shell Martinez Spill, near the project area
13 were used to evaluate potential oil spill impacts on biological resources. On April 23,
14 1988, about 9,500 barrels of San Joaquin Valley crude oil were accidentally released
15 from an above ground storage tank at the Shell Oil Company Martinez Manufacturing
16 Complex (Fischel and Robilliard 1991). The oil flowed into Peyton Slough and entered
17 Suisun Bay and Carquinez Strait. The oil spread through most of Carquinez Strait and
18 along the south shore of Suisun Bay as far as Port Chicago. The spill also contacted
19 both sides of Roe Island and the southern shores of Ryer Island and Simmons Island.

20 21 Plankton

22
23 Impacts to plankton from an oil spill could range from direct lethal effects caused by
24 high concentrations of oil in the surface layers of the water column after a major spill to
25 a variety of sublethal effects such as decreased phytoplankton photosynthesis and
26 abnormal feeding and behavioral patterns in zooplankton. Studies of oil spills have
27 generally failed to document major damage to plankton, although lethal effects or
28 severe oiling of individual zooplankton organisms in the immediate vicinity of a spill has
29 been reported in a number of studies. Because plankton distribution and abundance
30 are so variable in time and space, evidence of damage might be very difficult to
31 document, even if it did occur.

32
33 Because the San Francisco Bay is a semi-enclosed system, plankton are more
34 vulnerable to oil than on the open coast and are likely to be exposed to the oil for a
35 longer period of time. Furthermore, recruitment from adjoining unoiled areas might be
36 less available. Plankton communities in San Pablo and Suisun Bays would be
37 particularly vulnerable to an oil spill because these areas are most isolated from
38 recruitment from open ocean plankton populations. Furthermore, the phytoplankton
39 populations in Suisun Bay have been decimated from heavy grazing by the Asian clam.
40 Zooplankton species such as the copepod *Eurytemora affinis* and the opossum shrimp,
41 *Neomysis mercedis* also would be particularly susceptible to an oil spill because they
42 have restricted distributions centered on Suisun Bay and because populations have
43 declined substantially in recent years. The most sensitive area for plankton within the
44 San Francisco Bay estuary is in the entrapment zone where phytoplankton populations
45 and important zooplankton species, such as the opossum shrimp, tend to concentrate.
46 During periods of low river flow, the entrapment zone is located in the eastern part of
47 Suisun Bay and the western Delta. During periods of high flow, it is located throughout

1 Suisun Bay and into Carquinez Strait. Within San Pablo and Suisun Bays,
2 phytoplankton and zooplankton populations are most abundant over the shallow areas.
3 The impacts to plankton of a spill at the Shore marine terminal have the potential to be
4 significant (Class I or II).

5
6 Unocal EIR modeled Scenarios No. 5 and No. 6 both indicated that a 1,000 barrel spill
7 in the vicinity of Shore Terminals could have a substantial adverse impact to plankton
8 because each of them affected more than 10 percent of the open water habitat in
9 Suisun Bay. Scenario No. 5 contacted 48.93 of the open water habitat in Suisun Bay
10 and Scenario No. 6 contacted 16.97 of the open water habitat in Suisun Bay. Similarly,
11 the trajectory analyses in the Shore Terminal Oil Spill Response Plan indicated that in
12 the winter most of Suisun Bay west of Simmons Island and the eastern end of
13 Carquinez Strait would have greater than a 50 percent probability of contact with oil.
14 Under summer conditions the model indicated that much of Suisun Bay east of the
15 Shore terminal pier would have a greater than 50 percent chance of contact with oil.
16 Based on these analyses, plankton communities are judged to be at high risk of
17 significant adverse impacts from a large spill at Shore Terminals.

18 19 Benthos

20
21 The impacts of an oil spill on the benthos within San Francisco Bay has the potential to
22 be pervasive and long-lasting because oil can become entrapped within the semi-enclosed
23 system of the Bay and repeatedly redistributed into the sediments. For example the
24 impacts to mudflat communities of the 1969 West Falmouth spill were still detectable
25 years after the spill (Blumer and Sass 1972). The benthos of San Francisco Bay is
26 dominated by introduced opportunistic species that would recover rapidly from a spill.
27 An oil spill would be likely to selectively affect more sensitive species such as
28 amphipods, increasing the domination of hardy exotic species. Impacts to soft
29 substrate benthos within San Francisco Bay would be most severe in intertidal mudflats
30 where oil would wash ashore and become incorporated in the sediments. An oil spill
31 within San Francisco Bay has the potential to cause significant impacts to the benthos
32 in intertidal mudflat and shallow slough channels (Class I or II). On the other hand,
33 benthic organisms in the ship channels and deeper portions of the bay would be less
34 vulnerable to oil spill impacts because oil tends to float and would not be expected to
35 coat the subtidal substrate the way it could intertidal mudflats.

36
37 Impacts to the benthos were documented in the 1988 Shell Martinez Spill (Fischel and
38 Robilliard 1991). Surveys after the spill determined that benthic organisms were absent
39 in the most heavily oiled portions of Peyton Slough. The abundance and diversity of
40 epibenthic invertebrates were lower in the oiled sloughs than in unoiled areas. Grass
41 shrimp abundance was lowest in the heavily oiled Peyton and West Martinez mudflats.
42 Clams from Peyton Slough had higher concentrations of petroleum aromatic
43 hydrocarbons in their tissues than clams from other areas.

44
45 The most sensitive benthic invertebrate resource that would be at risk from an oil spill at
46 Shore Terminals is Dungeness crab. The juvenile stages of Dungeness crab are found
47 throughout San Francisco Bay, but especially in San Pablo Bay. The juvenile stages of

1 this species might be particularly vulnerable to oil. An oil spill could have significant,
2 adverse impacts on Dungeness crab because a spill at the time when juvenile
3 Dungeness crab are moving through San Francisco Bay would interfere with migration
4 patterns and because a large spill could substantially affect a year class and result in a
5 population decline (Class I or II).

7 The relative risk to the benthos from an oil spill can be evaluated by the percentage of
8 the resource contacted by Scenarios No. 5 and 6 in the Unocal EIR. In Scenario 5, a
9 1,000 barrel spill near Shore Terminals contacted 68.6 percent of the intertidal mudflat in
10 Suisun Bay. On the other hand, in Scenario 6, only 9.1 percent of the intertidal mudflat
11 in Suisun Bay was oiled. Therefore, depending on the conditions at the time of the spill,
12 impacts from a large spill at Shore Terminals on the intertidal benthos might or might
13 not be substantial. Intertidal mudflat is at moderate risk from a spill at Shore Terminals.

15 Both Scenario No. 5 and No. 6 contacted 100 percent of the juvenile Dungeness crab
16 habitat in Suisun Bay. However, oil in these scenarios contacted only 2.4 percent of the
17 total juvenile Dungeness crab habitat in San Francisco Bay. Therefore, juvenile crabs
18 in the local area would be at high risk from a spill at Shore Terminals but the juvenile
19 Dungeness crab population as a whole would be at relatively low risk.

21 The oil spill trajectory analysis in Shore Terminals Oil Spill Response Plan indicates that
22 much of the intertidal mudflat habitat in Suisun Bay has a greater than 50 percent
23 probability of contact with oil during a reasonable worst case spill. The significant
24 mudflat habitat at Suisun Shoal would be contacted within the first 3 hours of a spill.
25 Under these oil spill scenarios most of the Dungeness crab habitat in Suisun Bay also
26 would be contacted by oil. In addition, under winter conditions, oil would spread into
27 southeast San Pablo Bay where additional intertidal mudflats and juvenile Dungeness
28 crab habitat would be contacted by oil.

30 Eelgrass

32 Another marine resource within San Francisco Bay that would be particularly vulnerable
33 to oil spill impacts is eelgrass. Many studies on the biological impacts of oil spills have
34 documented impacts to marine grasses. For example, eelgrass growth and
35 reproduction appear to have been impaired by oil contamination from the Exxon Valdez
36 spill (Holloway 1991). Neither Scenario No. 5 or Scenario No. 6 contacted any eelgrass
37 habitat. Under the winter conditions the modeled worst case spill might contact some
38 eelgrass habitat in San Pablo Bay although the probability of eelgrass habitat being
39 oiled would be less than 10 percent (Blue Water Consultants 2001). Under the
40 10,000 barrel spill trajectory analysis performed for Clean Bay some eelgrass habitat in
41 San Pablo Bay would be contacted by oil (Wickland Oil Martinez 1998). No eelgrass
42 was oiled in the 1988 Shell Martinez spill. Therefore, eelgrass is at relatively low risk
43 from a spill at Shore Terminals. Impacts of an oil spill on eelgrass would be significant
44 (Class I or II).

Fishes

Although major fish kills from oil spills have rarely been reported, evidence exists that oil pollution could have negative effects on all the life history stages of fishes. Malins and Hodgins (1981), in a literature review on petroleum effects on marine fishes, concluded that ample evidence existed that fishes exposed to petroleum in sediments, water, or through the diet accumulate hydrocarbons in tissues and body fluids. Laboratory studies thus have shown that the accumulation of hydrocarbons in fishes leads to a number of deleterious biological changes that can affect health and survival. Many of these effects were induced at relatively high concentrations that would be unlikely to be encountered in the marine environment. Moreover, adult fishes may be able to avoid an oiled area. There is some evidence of avoidance of hydrocarbons by fishes in the field but observations are few and circumstantial (NRC 1985). An indirect effect of oil spills on fish populations is a decrease in the invertebrate food base. Impacts of oil spills to adult fishes have varied from windrows of dead fishes observed in the West Falmouth spill (Sanders 1977) to no apparent effect.

Larval stages are sensitive to much lower concentrations of oil than those shown to affect adults. Moreover, adult fishes would be able to avoid an oiled area, but planktonic eggs and larvae would not; therefore, the egg and larval stages would be the most susceptible to adverse impacts. For example, in the 1989 spill of fuel oil from the tanker World Prodigy in Naragansett Bay, the early life stages of several fish species were observed to suffer significant impacts within the slick (Spaulding 1989).

Particularly sensitive fish species within the San Francisco Bay estuary include those with a restricted distribution, such as the federal and state threatened Delta smelt, as well as the anadromous fishes that pass through the northern reach on their way to the Delta and Central Valley rivers to spawn. All these species are at particular risk not only because a large percentage of their populations might be contacted by a single oil spill, but also because their populations have been declining in recent years. The project area is designated Critical Habitat for Delta smelt, winter run and spring run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead.

The adult stages of anadromous fishes would probably be far less vulnerable to a spill than the early life stages. Adults pass quickly through the Bay on their way upstream to spawn and would be exposed to oil only briefly. Because most spilled oil is on the surface and the fishes are in the water column in the deep waters of the estuary, they would be unlikely to come into direct contact with oil. The juvenile stages of striped bass, steelhead and Chinook salmon, however, tend to spend considerable time in the shallow waters of the North Bay before they pass out of the Golden Gate and into the open ocean. If oil became trapped in the shallow waters of the North Bay, young striped bass and young Chinook salmon might be particularly at risk. Potential impacts of a spill within the San Francisco Bay estuary on Delta smelt and anadromous fishes would be significant (Class I or II).

Fishes that spawn in the Bay also might be particularly vulnerable to an oil spill because the egg and larval stages are so sensitive to oil. Important fish species that spawn

1 primarily in the Bay include Pacific herring, longfin smelt, yellowfin goby, plainfin
2 midshipman, bay goby, and topsmelt. Impacts to Pacific herring, which lay thin eggs on
3 the partially hard substrate within the estuary, would be particularly susceptible to oil
4 and impacts of a spill in the Bay could be significant (Class I or II). Several studies
5 documented lethal and sublethal effects of oil on the eggs and larvae of Pacific herring
6 following the 1989 *Exxon Valdez* oil spill (Norcross et al. 1996, McGurk and Brown
7 1996, Hose et al. 1996). Similarly, impacts to longfin smelt, which spawn primarily in
8 the fresh-water at the eastern end of the estuary, could be significant if oil got into this
9 part of the estuary (Class I or II). Impacts to other species that spawn in the estuary
10 would only be significant in the case of an extremely expansive slick because these
11 species are widely distributed (Class III for most spills). Species that spawn in both the
12 Bay and the ocean would be less vulnerable. This latter group included Pacific
13 staghorn sculpin, jacksmelt, and northern anchovy (Class III impacts). The federal
14 threatened Sacramento splittail is present in the project area, but because its population
15 is mostly in freshwater, oil spill impacts to this sensitive species probably would be less
16 than significant (Class III).

17
18 To determine the relative risk to fishes from an oil spill at Shore Terminals, the
19 percentage of habitat of sensitive fish species contacted by Unocal EIR Scenarios No. 5
20 and 6, a 1,000 barrel spill near Shore Terminals, was analyzed. Based on that analysis
21 the relative risk to Pacific herring, juvenile Chinook salmon, striped bass, American
22 shad, white sturgeon, starry flounder and the fish assemblage of Suisun Marsh was
23 relatively low. Neither of these spill scenarios contacted Pacific herring spawning areas
24 or the sloughs of Suisun Marsh. Scenarios No. 5 and 6 each contacted less than
25 0.1 percent of the shallow water habitat used by outmigrating Chinook salmon smolt.
26 Therefore, although a large oil spill would have a significant (Class I or II) adverse
27 impact on spring and winter run Chinook salmon and Central Valley steelhead because
28 it would contaminate designated Critical Habitat, the risk of substantially affecting the
29 population of these sensitive species is relatively low. Both of these scenarios also
30 affected less than 10 percent of the preferred habitat of striped bass and white
31 sturgeon, indicating a low risk to these anadromous species. However, Scenario No. 5
32 contacted 13.7 percent of American shad habitat and 10.7 percent of starry flounder
33 habitat (Scenario No. 6 contacted less than 2 percent of the habitat of these species).
34 Therefore, American shad and starry flounder could be considered to be at moderate
35 risk from a spill at Shore Terminals.

36
37 The federal and state listed threatened Delta smelt is the sensitive species most at risk
38 from a spill at the Shore marine terminal. Scenario No. 5 contacted 55 percent of the
39 shallow water habitat in Suisun Bay where a large portion of the Delta smelt population
40 could come in contact with oil. In addition, as discussed above, Scenarios 5 and
41 6 indicate that the plankton assemblage, which includes the zooplankton prey of the
42 Delta smelt, is at high risk from a spill at Shore Terminals.

43
44 The larger oil spills modeled in Shore Terminals' Oil Spill Response Plan and the
45 10,000 barrel spill trajectory analysis performed for Clean Bay are consistent with the
46 relative risk to sensitive fish species derived from the Unocal spill scenarios except that

1 Pacific herring spawning habitat in San Pablo Bay would be at some risk of contact from
2 these larger spills and a larger percentage of habitat used by young Chinook salmon
3 might be oiled.

4
5 Localized effects on fishes were observed in the Shell Martinez spill. Fish abundance
6 was reduced in the oiled sloughs, but no region-wide impacts on fishes were detected
7 (Fischel and Robilliard 1991). Studies following the Martinez spill showed that
8 individuals of the staghorn sculpin (*Leptocottus armatus*) in the vicinity of the spill had
9 enhanced hydrocarbon metabolizing enzymes (Spies 1989). These results suggest that
10 the spill may have had localized sublethal effects on resident fish populations.

11 12 Tidal Marshes

13
14 Vegetated marshes within the San Francisco estuary are one of the habitats which
15 would be most sensitive to an oil spill. In most oil spills that have contacted
16 saltmarshes, damage has been noted to marsh vegetation (NRC 1985). When a large
17 spill drifts ashore, tidal areas often are subjected to heavy oiling. In the case of
18 saltmarshes, oil may become incorporated into sediments where it may persist for
19 years. Furthermore, San Francisco Bay tidal marshes provide habitat for many
20 sensitive species. Clearly any saltmarsh in San Francisco Bay would be likely to suffer
21 significant impacts if it was contacted by oil from a spill associated with the Shore
22 marine terminal (Class I or II). The Area Contingency Plan (USCG and OSPR 2000)
23 identifies tidal marshes in San Francisco Bay as areas with high priority for protection in
24 the event of an oil spill.

25
26 In Unocal Scenario No. 5, oil contacted 68.3 percent of the tidal marsh habitat in Suisun
27 Bay and 12 percent in the entire San Francisco Estuary. In Scenario No. 6, 20.1 percent
28 of the tidal marsh in Suisun Bay and 3.5 percent of the marsh in San Francisco Estuary
29 were oiled. Marshes oiled in both these scenarios included Martinez Marsh, Peyton
30 Slough/Bulls Head Marsh, Point Edith, Hastings Slough, Seal Island and Shore Acres
31 Marsh. In addition, in Scenario No. 5 oil contacted Roe Island, Simmons Island,
32 Freeman Island, Snag Island, and portions of Goodyear Sough. Project area marshes
33 clearly are at high risk from a large spill at Shore Terminals. Sensitive plant species in
34 these marshes also are at high risk from a spill at the Shore marine terminal. These
35 sensitive plant species include the federal endangered Suisun thistle, the federal
36 endangered and state rare soft bird's beak, the state rare Mason's lilaeopsis, the Delta
37 tule pea (California Native Plant Society 1B list), Delta mugwort (California Native Plant
38 Society List 2) and Suisun marsh aster (California Native Plant Society 1B list).

39
40 In the winter season oil trajectory run in Shore Terminals Oil Spill Response Plan,
41 Hastings Slough, Point Edith, Seal Island, Bulls Head Marsh, Martinez Marsh and
42 Benicia Marsh were all contacted by oil within 3 hours. Goodyear Slough, Southampton
43 Bay, Ryer Island, and Roe Island were contacted by oil within 6 hours. For the summer
44 season spill, Hastings Slough, Point Edith, Seal Island and Bulls Head Marsh were
45 contacted by oil within 3 hours and Goodyear Slough, Benicia Marsh, Ryer Island, Roe
46 Island and Martinez Marsh were contacted by oil within 6 hours. Other project area
47 marshes were contacted by oil in these modeled spills but it took 12 hours or more for
48 oil to reach them, indicating lower risk.

1 Approximately 148 acres of marsh shoreline were oiled by the 1988 Shell Martinez spill,
2 of which 32 acres were heavily oiled (almost completely covered with oil), 15 acres were
3 moderately oiled, and about 98 acres were lightly oiled (small isolated patches of oil)
4 (Fischel and Robilliard 1991). The area of slough banks oiled was approximately
5 4 acres. The marsh vegetation was most heavily oiled along the shoreline east of
6 Peyton Slough and at Ryer Island. Much of the heavily oiled vegetation was removed
7 as part of clean up activities. By fall of 1989 areas that had been heavily oiled were
8 recovering from the spill.

9 10 Avifauna

11
12 Oil spills can affect birds directly through oil contamination and indirectly through
13 degradation of important habitat. The direct effect of oiling on birds is predominantly
14 contamination of feathers, removing insulative qualities and reducing buoyancy (Holmes
15 and Cronshaw 1977; Moskoff 2000). Oiling of feathers leads to elevated metabolic rate
16 and hypothermia (Hartung 1967). Oiled birds may also ingest oil through preening of
17 feathers or feeding on contaminated prey. Effects of ingested oil can range from acute
18 irritation and difficulties in water absorption to general pathologic changes in some
19 organs (e.g., Crocker et al. 1974; Fry 1987; Nero and Associates 1983). Ingestion of oil
20 can also result in changes in yolk structure, and reduction in number of eggs laid and
21 egg hatchability (Hartung 1965; Grau et al. 1977). Oiled birds that are able to return to
22 a nest can contaminate the exterior of eggs, reducing hatchability (e.g., Hartung 1965;
23 Patten and Patten 1977).

24
25 Indirect effects result principally from contamination of habitat where feeding occurs.
26 These effects may be significant in shallow waters of bays, mudflats, and estuaries
27 where waterfowl, rails, wading birds, and shorebirds feed. For these birds, loss or
28 reduction in food resources can affect survival during migration and success of nesting
29 efforts.

30
31 Marine birds are known to be conspicuous casualties of oil spills (e.g., Hope-Jones
32 et al. 1970; Ford et al. 1991a, b). For example, it has been estimated that between
33 100,000 and 435,000 birds died within 3 months of the Exxon Valdez spill (Moskoff
34 2000). Those species suffering greatest mortality from past spills along the outer coast
35 have been alcids, cormorants, loons, grebes, and scoters (Smail et al. 1972; Dobbin
36 et al. 1986; Page and Carter 1986). These groups are more vulnerable because they
37 are found in large numbers on the water. Other birds typically spend less time on the
38 water or will relocate from the area affected by a spill (e.g., gulls, terns and pelicans;
39 SOWLS et al. 1980). Initial surveys of damage to birds following the 1988 Shell Martinez
40 Spill reported that 450 birds were oiled and 192 died from the oil contact (Chan 1992).

41
42 Seabirds have regional populations that are centered predominantly off the outer coast.
43 Therefore, the significance of impacts from an oil spill within San Francisco Bay are
44 unlikely to have a significant effect on the regional population of most seabird species.
45 Impacts to seabirds from a spill at Shore Terminals would be adverse but less than
46 significant (Class III). Western gulls have breeding colonies throughout the project
47 area, but this species has relatively minimal direct interaction with water and is not very
48 vulnerable to oil spills.

1 Sensitive seabird species that occur in San Francisco Bay include the federal and state
2 endangered California least tern, the state and federal endangered California brown
3 pelican and the double crested cormorant, a California Species of Special Concern.
4 These species spend much of their time out of contact with the water so they have a
5 relatively low vulnerability to direct oiling. The impacts of an oil spill would be primarily
6 loss of foraging habitat. Loss of foraging habitat for the California least tern is of
7 particular concern because least terns breed at Pittsburg at the eastern end of the
8 project area. Loss of foraging habitat during the least tern breeding season would be a
9 significant adverse impact (Class I or II). Double-crested cormorants also have a small
10 colony on Wheeler Island in Suisun Bay east of the project area. All of the modeled oil
11 spill scenarios resulted in a substantial amount of oil on the waters of Suisun Bay
12 indicating that the foraging habitat of the small colonies of California least tern and
13 double-crested cormorant would be contaminated from a spill of 1,000 barrels or more
14 at Shore Terminals. Therefore, foraging habitat of the breeding colonies of these
15 seabirds is at high risk from a spill at Shore Terminals. California brown pelicans do not
16 breed in the project area and their major roosting sites are in the Central Bay.
17 Therefore, important foraging habitat for the California brown pelican is at relatively low
18 risk from a spill at Shore Terminals.

19
20 Large migrant or wintering populations of loons, grebes, and scoters are found in
21 San Francisco Bay from about October through March. In the Bay, the migrant or
22 wintering waterfowl also includes large populations of diving or dabbling ducks that
23 spend most time on the water where they can be contacted by oil spills. The
24 San Francisco Bay estuary is used by several hundred thousand waterfowl from late fall
25 through spring as a critical feeding ground. Substantial mortality of wintering waterfowl
26 or loss of essential habitat would likely result from oil spills and would constitute a
27 significant impact (Class I or II).

28
29 All of the modeled oil spills resulted in 10 percent or more of the open water in Suisun
30 Bay being contacted by oil. Therefore waterfowl are at relatively high risk of localized
31 impacts from a spill at Shore Terminals. Unocal Scenario No. 5, a 1,000 barrel spill
32 near Shore Terminals under winter conditions, resulted in oil contact with 5.3 percent of
33 the waterfowl habitat in San Francisco Bay with an estimated mortality of 50 to
34 200 birds. Therefore although some birds would likely be lost, the number is relatively
35 small. However, particularly high densities of canvasbacks are found in Grizzly Bay.
36 Unocal Scenario No. 5 resulted in a substantial amount of oil entering Grizzly Bay. Of
37 the oil spill trajectories modeled for Shore's Oil Spill Response Plan, the winter
38 trajectory showed that oil had a 40 to 50 percent chance of entering Grizzly Bay and
39 under the summer conditions the probability was greater than 50 percent. Based on
40 these oil spill models, wintering canvasback are at substantial risk from a spill at Shore
41 Terminals.

42
43 In San Francisco Bay, habitat of rails, terns, wading birds, and shorebirds could also be
44 contacted by oil spills (e.g., the 1988 Shell Oil Refinery spill, Palawski and Takekawa
45 1988). Direct effects on these birds from oil spills are suspected but difficult to assess.
46 Observations of oil-streaked shorebirds are common immediately following oil spills, but
47 carcasses are rarely recovered (Larsen and Richardson 1990). It is likely that
48 shorebirds and wading birds are able to avoid oiling to some extent by retreating from

1 exposed habitat. Even if contacted, they may be able to avoid hypothermia from light
2 oiling because they remain on land and may find some shelter in vegetation.
3 Nevertheless, preening of oiled feathers would lead to ingestion of oil and resultant
4 pathological effects. Another serious concern is secondary impacts from contamination
5 of food resources on beaches and mudflats. Not only could oil ingestion take place
6 during feeding, the presence of oil might substantially reduce the food available to
7 sustain these populations. The San Francisco Bay estuary is used by up to 1 million
8 shorebirds as a critical feeding area in the Pacific Flyway. Substantial mortality of
9 wintering shorebirds or loss of essential habitat would likely result from oil spills and
10 would constitute a significant impact (Class I or II).

11
12 Less than 1 percent of the wintering shorebird population in San Francisco Bay occurs
13 in Suisun Bay (Chambers Group 1994). Therefore, the risk of significant population
14 impacts to shorebirds from a spill at Shore Terminals is low. However, based on the
15 modeled oil spill scenarios intertidal mudflat habitat within the project area is at
16 moderate risk of contact with oil from a spill at Shore Terminals, suggesting that there
17 may be localized impacts to shorebirds. Suisun Shoal, an important shorebird foraging
18 and roosting location near the Shore terminal pier is at particular risk from a spill at
19 Shore Terminals. The oil trajectory analysis done for the Shore Terminals Oil Spill
20 Response Plan indicated that Suisun Shoal would be contacted by oil from a spill at
21 Shore Terminals within 3 hours.

22
23 The state threatened California black rail occurs in marshes throughout the project area.
24 Based on recent surveys, close to 45 percent of the black rail population in
25 San Francisco Bay occurs in marshes in Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay (Spautz and
26 Nur 2002). As discussed above, trajectory analysis of large oil spills originating at or
27 near Shore Terminals, indicate that project area marshes are at high risk from an oil
28 spill at the terminal. Therefore black rails are at high risk from a spill associated with
29 operation of the Shore marine terminal. The federal and state endangered California
30 clapper rail also would be affected if a spill at Shore Terminals fouled marshes in the
31 project area. However, although some individual clapper rails might suffer adverse
32 effects, most of the California clapper rail population in San Francisco Bay is located
33 outside the project area and the overall risk of a Shore Terminals spill to the California
34 clapper rail population as a whole is low. Other sensitive birds, such as the Suisun
35 song sparrow and saltmarsh common yellowthroat, associated with marshes in the
36 project area are far less sensitive to oil spills because they have little direct contact with
37 the water.

38
39 Oiled birds recovered alive sometimes can be successfully cleaned and rehabilitated.
40 Based on a review of the literature, the Unocal EIR estimated the success of mitigation
41 by rehabilitation of oiled birds at 17 percent of the oiled birds for spills in the
42 San Francisco Bay Area and 9 percent on the outer coast (Chambers Group 1994).

43 Marine Mammals

44
45
46 Significant impacts could occur if oil contacted a harbor seal haul out area (Class I or II).
47 Oil on land and in the nearshore waters where harbor seals forage would produce

greatest damage during the spring pupping season. Although adult harbor seals can die in oil spills, this would be relatively rare and have a minor effect on the population. From data in Mansfield (1970), heavy oiling of a haulout site might kill up to 5 percent of adult animals present. A more serious threat is oiling of newborn pups whose dense fur (lanugo) protects them from cold. Death could result from hypothermia, ingestion of oil, or starvation if separated from the mother. An oil spill from the Shore marine terminal has an extremely low probability of contacting a harbor seal haul out site. Therefore harbor seals are at very low risk from a spill at the Shore marine terminal.

Ability to Protect Sensitive Resources from a Spill at Shore Terminals

Shore Terminals' Oil Spill Response Plan (Blue Water Consultants 2001) was evaluated in the context of the Area Contingency Plan (USCG and OSPR 2000) strategies to protect sensitive resources most at risk from a spill at Shore Terminals. Shore Terminals' oil spill response capability is discussed in greater detail in Section 3.1.3.1.

Shore Terminals' Oil Spill Response Plan recognizes sensitive resources at most risk from a spill at the terminal. These are listed in Table 2-11 of the Oil Spill Response Plan. Sensitive areas that could be impacted within three hours of a spill are the greatest concern for immediate protection. These resources include Suisun Shoal, Hastings Slough/Point Edith/Seal Island, Bulls Head Marsh/Pacheco Creek, Martinez Marsh and Benicia Marsh. To protect these areas according to the strategies in the Area Contingency Plan, a minimum of 10,000 feet of boom is required. Although, through its oil spill response contractor NRC, Shore Terminals has access to almost 65,000 feet of boom, it appears that only 5,100 feet of boom are available from locations where they can be deployed within 3 hours. Therefore, Shore Terminals may not have adequate boom available to protect all the sensitive areas that may be oiled within 3 hours of a spill at the terminal. Furthermore, the Area Contingency Plan recommends using sonic devices to scare birds away from Suisun Shoal if this area becomes oiled. The Shore Terminals' Oil Spill Response Plan does not identify a source of such sonic devices, although it does identify a contractor for rehabilitating oiled wildlife.

Mitigation Measures for BIO-6:

The following mitigation measures shall be implemented by Shore Terminals to mitigate oil spill impacts to the maximum extent feasible:

BIO-6a: Implement all the mitigation measures included in OS-3 through OS-6 in Operational Safety/Risk of Accidents to either lower the probability of an oil spill or increase response capability.

BIO-6b: Demonstrate to the satisfaction of the CSLC that Shore Terminals can successfully implement its Oil Spill Response Plan and can deploy within 3 hours all the boom necessary to simultaneously protect all the sensitive resources at risk of contact with oil within 3 hours from a spill at Shore Terminals.

BIO-6c: Identify a source of sonic hazing devices to scare birds away from Suisun Shoal and demonstrate to the CSLC that these devices can be deployed within 3 hours of a spill at Shore Terminals.

BIO-6d: When a spill occurs, develop procedures for clean up of any sensitive biological areas contacted by oil, in consultation with biologists from CDFG and USFWS, to avoid damage from clean up activities.

BIO-6e: If damage occurs, the last resort is restoration and compensation. Any loss of resources shall be documented as soon as possible after a large spill. The sampling methods and design should be determined beforehand, and the plan should include provisions for getting resources onsite as soon as possible so that post-spill studies can begin immediately.

Rationale for Mitigation: Containment of small spills and protection of sensitive resources may reduce biological impacts to less than significant (Class III) for small spills. For large spills, significant impacts are likely. Sensitive areas that could be impacted within three hours of a spill are the greatest concern for immediate protection including Suisun Shoal, Hastings Slough/Point Edith/Seal Island, Bulls Head Marsh/Pacheco Creek, Martinez Marsh and Benicia Marsh. Implementing measures OS-3 through OS-6 help increase response capability and reduce risk of accidents. The Area Contingency Plan strategies require a minimum of 10,000 feet of boom for protection. Although, through its oil spill response contractor NRC, Shore Terminals has access to almost 65,000 feet of boom, it appears that only 5,100 feet of boom are available from locations where they can be deployed within 3 hours. Shore Terminals, therefore, by providing adequate boom available to protect all the sensitive areas that may be oiled within 3 hours of a spill at the terminal, would be providing the maximum feasible mitigation to aid in oil containment. In addition, the Area Contingency Plan recommends using sonic devices to scare birds away from Suisun Shoal if this area becomes oiled. The Shore Terminals' Oil Spill Response Plan does not identify a source of such sonic devices, thus, by identifying a source (assuming one is available locally), sonic devices should then be able to be used to scare birds away during cleanup actions. Consultation for cleanup actions with CDFG and USFWS will avoid damage that can occur during cleanup operations. Immediate documentation of any damage from oil spills is critical to the determination of compensation and methods for data collection determined prior to a spill aids in the effectiveness of documentation.

Residual Impacts: For large spills, oil is likely to contact sensitive resources and impacts would remain significant (Class I) even with mitigation.

3.3.3.2 Oil Spills from Vessels in Transit in Bay or along Outer Coast

Impact BIO-7: Biological Resources Impacts from Accidental Spills

A significant impact to biological resources (Class I or II impact) could result from spills of crude oil or product from a vessel in transit along tanker routes either in San Francisco Bay or outer coast waters.

The impacts to biological resources of oil from a spill associated with vessels servicing the Shore marine terminal would be similar to the impacts described above for a spill at

1 the terminal. A significant impact to biological resources (Class I or II impact) probably
2 would result from an accidental spill of crude oil or oil product from a vessel spill along
3 tanker routes either in San Francisco Bay or outer coast waters. A larger oil spill is
4 more likely from a vessel accident than a spill at the marine terminal. Most tanker
5 spills/accidents and larger spills that cannot be quickly contained either in the Bay or
6 along the outer coast would result in significant, adverse (Class I) impacts.

7
8 To identify the likely impacts to biological resources from a spill from a tanker traveling
9 to or from the Shore marine terminal, the oil spill scenarios developed in the Unocal EIR
10 for tanker spills was used (Chambers Group 1994).

11
12 Table 3.3-8 summarizes the resources most likely to be affected by a spill from tankers
13 visiting Shore Terminals. This table includes the relative sensitivity of the resource to
14 oil, the vulnerability of the resource within San Francisco Bay, and the relative risk from
15 a spill from a tanker servicing the terminal. Sensitivity is an estimation of the extent to
16 which the resource is likely to be harmed if contacted by oil. Vulnerability is the extent
17 to which a large portion of the resource is within the area that is likely to be contacted by
18 a spill from tankers. Species that have a large portion of their populations outside of the
19 Bay or in nontidal areas are less vulnerable to a spill than species such as the Delta
20 smelt, with most of their population within the Bay. The risk is the probability that a
21 substantial percentage of the resource would be contacted by an oil spill from tankers
22 based oil spill scenarios developed for the Unocal EIR. Clearly, given the wrong set of
23 conditions, even a resource determined to be at low risk could suffer significant impacts
24 from an oil spill from a tanker. However, based on the analysis presented above,
25 resources determined to be at low risk are unlikely to be contacted by a spill from tanker
26 operations. Species determined to be at moderate risk either have less than a
27 15 percent probability of any contact by medium or heavy doses of oil or their
28 distribution is such that, although some portions of the resource might be at high risk,
29 most of the resource is located in areas with a low probability of contact from a tanker
30 spill.

31
32 Based on sensitivity, vulnerability, and the extent to which a tanker spill could contact a
33 substantial portion of the resource, resources most likely to suffer substantial impacts
34 from a tanker spill include:

- 35
36 ➤ Rocky intertidal habitat
37 ➤ Juvenile Dungeness crabs
38 ➤ Wintering waterfowl (if spill occurs in winter)
39 ➤ Double-crested cormorant
40 ➤ California clapper rails and black rails
41 ➤ Marsh sandwort (if spill occurs near Golden Gate)
42 ➤ California least tern
43 ➤ California brown pelican
44

1 Mitigation Measures for BIO-7:

2
3 **BIO-7:** Shore Terminals shall implement mitigation measures OS-8a and OS-8b of the
4 Operational Safety/Risk of Upset section addressing potential participation in
5 VTS upgrade evaluations, and Shore response actions for spills at or near the
6 terminal.
7

8 Rationale for Mitigation: Response capability for containment and cleanup of vessel
9 spills while transiting the Bay or outer coast is not Shore's responsibility. However,
10 Shore's participation in these measures, particularly for providing response capability for
11 spills near the terminal can help to reduce impacts to biological resources by increasing
12 response capability. Impacts to biological resources from spills near the terminal
13 caused by transiting vessels may be able to be reduced to less than significant with
14 containment by Shore Terminals with implementation of OS-8b.
15

16 Residual Impacts: Even with these measures, the residual impacts to biological
17 resources may remain significant (Class I).
18
19

20 **3.3.4 Alternatives**

21
22 **3.3.4.1 No Project Alternative**

23
24 **Impact BIO-8: Effects on Biological Resources with No New Shore Terminals**
25 **Lease**
26

27 **The alternative would eliminate the biological resources impacts associated with**
28 **wharf operations at the Shore terminal resulting in a beneficial (Class IV) impact.**
29 **Biological resources impacts (Class I, II and III) would be transferred to other**
30 **marine terminals and would be similar to the Proposed Project. Shore has no**
31 **responsibility for these other terminals.**
32

33 With this alternative, the impacts to biological resources in San Francisco Bay from
34 operations of the Shore marine terminal would be eliminated. These impacts include
35 disturbance of vessel traffic and maintenance dredging, the risk of introduction of exotic
36 species in ballast water, the chronic input to Bay waters of small amounts of
37 contaminants, and the risk of an oil spill at the terminal.
38

39 The transfer of tanker traffic from Shore Terminals to another marine terminal would
40 eliminate impacts to biological resources from operations at the Shore marine terminal
41 but would transfer some of the impacts to another site. Because the additional tanker
42 traffic at another marine terminal would not be expected to increase needed
43 maintenance dredging at the other terminal or small chronic input of contaminants from
44 storm runoff, this alternative would have slightly fewer operational impacts to biological
45 resources than continued terminal operations at Shore Terminals.
46
47

1 Biological impacts associated with vessels would be transferred to another marine
2 terminal and would be similar to the Proposed Project. These impacts include
3 disturbance to biological resources from boat traffic, sediment disturbance generated by
4 boat propellers and bow thrusters, introduction of exotic organisms in ballast water
5 discharges and by hull fouling, and introduction of toxins used as anti-fouling agents on
6 tankers. The potential impacts of spills on biological resources would depend on the
7 location of the other terminal. Biological resources in close proximity to the terminal
8 would be at greatest risk from an oil spill at the terminal. The potential impacts of a spill
9 from a tanker would be similar to the Proposed Project.

10
11 If the No Project Alternative involved removal of the Shore terminal pier, temporary
12 impacts to biological resources would occur by the noise and activity associated with
13 pier removal operations and by disturbance of sediments during pier removal. These
14 impacts would be short lived and are considered adverse but less than significant
15 (Class III).

16
17 BIO-8: No mitigation is required.
18
19

20 **3.3.4.2 Increased Use of Existing Pipelines for Continued Operation of Upland** 21 **Facility Alternative**

22 **Impact BIO-9: Continued Shore Upland Operations via Existing Pipelines**

23
24
25 **Increased use of existing pipelines would have no impacts from routine**
26 **operations. A pipeline spill or substantial leak that would reach a creek, stream,**
27 **lake, or other water body could result in a significant, adverse (Class I or II) impact**
28 **to biological resources, depending on whether the spill could be easily contained.**
29

30 Except in the case of an accident, no impacts to biological resources would occur from
31 the increased use of existing pipelines. The impacts of an oil spill from a pipeline to
32 biological resources would probably be less than from a spill at the Shore marine
33 terminal. If the spill occurred on land, oil would be transported less rapidly than a spill in
34 San Francisco Bay, and the spill would be more easily contained. Impacts to biological
35 resources could still be significant, however (Class I or II). The worst-case spill from a
36 pipeline would most likely be if oil were spilled into a river or creek. The oil could
37 contaminate a substantial amount of habitat if it was not rapidly contained and oil
38 potentially could be transported to San Francisco Bay.
39

40 Mitigation Measures for BIO-9:

41
42 **BIO-9a:** For pipelines used by Shore, a plan shall be developed to contain spilled oil
43 and protect sensitive biological resources in the event of an oil spill.
44

45 Rationale for Mitigation: For any pipelines that Shore would use or share use of, a
46 protection plan addressing emergency containment actions would result in an increase
47 in response capability. Small spills that can be quickly contained may be mitigated to
48 less than significant.
49

1 Residual Impacts: Even with the implementation of protection and containment
2 procedures, significant biological impacts (Class I) could still occur in the event of a
3 large spill.

4
5 **BIO-9b:** Implementation of OS-10b.

6
7 Rationale for Mitigation: OS-10b refers to mitigation measure GEO-14 adhering to
8 proper engineering design, inspection, maintenance and retrofitting of pipelines.

9
10 Residual Impacts: Significant adverse impacts (Class I) could occur if significant
11 amounts of oil affected biological resources.

12 13 14 **3.3.4.3 Modification to Existing Pipelines for Continued Operation of Upland 15 Facility Alternative**

16 17 **Impact BIO-10: Continued Shore Upland Operations via Modifications to Existing 18 Pipelines**

19
20 **Because the PG&E fuel oil line that would be used for this alternative is currently
21 inactive, implementation of this alternative would place risk of a leak or spill in a
22 pipeline where no such risk exists currently. Once constructed, no impacts
23 should occur from routine operations. Significant, adverse (Class I or II) impacts
24 to a waterbody could occur, depending on whether the spill could be easily
25 contained.**

26
27 The impacts of modifying an existing pipeline to allow continued operation of the upland
28 facility would be similar to those of using existing pipelines discussed above. In the
29 event of a pipeline break and spill or substantial leak, there is the potential that
30 significant impacts could occur to biological resources. This could result in a significant,
31 adverse (Class I or II) impact depending on whether the spill could be contained easily.
32 Because the PG&E fuel oil line that would be used for this alternative is currently
33 inactive, implementation of this alternative would place risk of a leak or spill in a pipeline
34 where no such risk exists currently. However, a spill or leak from a pipeline is less likely
35 than from tanker operations. Pipeline leaks and spills also are usually more readily
36 contained and cleaned up than spills from tankers. Therefore, this alternative would
37 have lower risk of significant adverse impacts to biological resources than the Proposed
38 Project.

39
40 There is some potential that activities to make this abandoned pipeline usable, could
41 disturb sensitive biological resources in the vicinity of the pipeline (Class I or II).
42 Impacts to sensitive resources could be mitigated by avoiding activities in areas that
43 support sensitive resources to the extent possible.

1 Mitigation Measures for BIO-10:

2
3 **BIO-10a:** For pipelines used by Shore, a plan shall be developed to contain spilled oil
4 and protect sensitive biological resources in the event of an oil spill.
5 Biological surveys should be conducted in areas that might be disturbed
6 during pipeline refurbishment. If sensitive resources are identified in these
7 areas, activities should be changed to avoid sensitive resources if possible. If
8 resources cannot be avoided, construction measures shall be implemented to
9 minimize construction impacts.

10
11 Rationale for Mitigation: For any pipelines that Shore would use or share use of, a
12 protection plan addressing emergency containment actions would result in an increase
13 in response capability. Surveys would help to identify sensitive resources. Small spills
14 that can be quickly contained may be mitigated to less than significant.

15
16 Residual Impacts: Even with the implementation of protection and containment
17 procedures, significant biological impacts (Class I) could still occur in the event of a
18 large spill.

19
20 **BIO-10b:** Implementation of OS-10b.

21
22 Rationale for Mitigation: OS-10b refers to mitigation measure GEO-14 adhering to
23 proper engineering design, inspection, maintenance and retrofitting of pipelines.

24
25 Residual Impacts: Significant adverse impacts (Class I) could occur if significant
26 amounts of oil affected biological resources.

